

VOLUME IV.

JANUARY, 1886.

NUMBER 3.

THE NARRAGANSETT

HISTORICAL REGISTER.

A MAGAZINE

DEVOTED TO THE ANTIQUITIES, GENEALOGY AND HISTORICAL MATTER
ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF THE

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations.

*A record of measures and of men,
For twelve full score years and ten.*

JAMES N. ARNOLD, EDITOR.

PUBLISHED BY
THE NARRAGANSETT HISTORICAL PUBLISHING COMPANY.
HAMILTON, R. I.

E. L. FREEMAN & SON, PRINTERS, CENTRAL FALLS, R. I.

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER.

	PAGE.
I. Canonchet. <i>Albert C. Greene</i>	161
II. A Road Damage.....	168
III. A List of the Births of South Kingstown, R. I. <i>The Editor</i>	169
IV. The Story of the Tablets. III. <i>James L. Sherman</i>	178
V. Improved Order of Red Men. <i>Fred J. Smith</i>	186
VI. The Record of Old Smithfield from 1730 to 1850. <i>The Editor</i>	189
VII. The French Spoliation Claims and Rhode Island Claimants. <i>Amasa M. Eaton</i>	202
VIII. Alexander's Deed to the Proprietors of Providence. <i>Fred A. Arnold</i> ...	238
IX. A Mythical Pedigree. <i>Ray Greene Huling</i>	235
X. Origin of name East Greenwich.....	
XI. Early History of Narragansett. <i>Steuben Jenkins</i>	
XII. Historical Notes—	
First Freewill Baptist Church in Rhode Island.....	177
An Old Bell.....	234
Change from Old to New Style. Marriage of Seth Arnold.....	248
XIII. Editorial Notes—	
Acknowledgements. Thanks. The United Service Magazine.....	253
The Proceedings of the Wyoming (Penn.) Historical and Genealogical Society.....	254
XIV. Societies and their Doings... ..	254

THE

Rhode Island Historical Magazine,

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

BY THE

Newport Historical Publishing Company,

NEWPORT AND PROVIDENCE, R. I.

TERMS - - - - - \$2.00 per year, in advance.

The Rhode Island Historical Magazine is devoted to the History, Biography and Genealogy of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. It will succeed the Newport Historical Magazine and contain not less than 80 pages.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO

The Newport Historical Publishing Co., or R. H. Tilley.
323 THAMES ST., NEWPORT, R. I.

THE
NARRAGANSETT Historical Register.

NARRAGANSETT PUB. CO. }
PUBLISHERS.

Terms, \$2.00 Per Annum.

{ JAMES N. ARNOLD,
EDITOR.

VOL. IV. HAMILTON, R. I., JANUARY, 1886.

No. 3.

CANONCHET.

BY ALBERT C. GREENE.

Re-published by special request of our South Kingstown patrons.

THE early history of New England contains no narrative of deeper interest than the story of the brave and unfortunate Canonchet, the "Great Sachem" of the Narragansetts, and the last who exercised actual supremacy over that powerful tribe. He was the son of Miantonomi, the noble and generous friend of Roger Williams, and the protector of the infant colony at Providence.

Miantonomi had been defeated and captured by the Sachem of the Mohegans, who has been well described as the "Canibal Uncas;" and after the ceremony of a trial before the Commissioners of the United Colonies, was, by their order, delivered to his captor to be put to death; and was, by the latter, murdered in cold blood.

At his father's death, Canonchet became, by inheritance, Chief Sachem of the tribe, and held that station at the time of the celebrated battle between them and the whites, familiarly known as the "Great Swamp Fight." This desperate

conflict occurred in December, 1675, on a spot within the present town of South Kingstown, in Rhode Island, and was long sustained on both sides with terrible energy, and great loss of life. The fort occupied by the Indians, contained a great number of cabins, (probably five or six hundred,) which had been erected as a shelter for their wives and children, and as places of deposit for their entire stock of provisions for the winter. During the battle the cabins were fired, many of the wounded, and of the women and children perished in the flames, and the whole of the corn and other stores of the tribe was utterly destroyed. Their defeat was disheartening and irretrievable. They lingered through the remainder of the winter; and, in the April following, Canonchet, having rallied the remnant of his broken forces in a distant part of his territory, intended there to commence a new plantation. The distressing circumstances arising from these events induced him, soon after his removal, to engage personally in a daring and romantic expedition to procure means of relief for his suffering followers.

That expedition resulted in his death. He was intercepted and seized by the whites — delivered to the Mohegan Sachem Oneco, the son of his father's murderer, and by him put to death, by order of the English captors. The last scenes of his life form the subject of the following imperfect sketch.

In the variety of incident contained in the whole record of Greek and Roman heroism, there is not a more noble picture of high and unbending honor, of stern and enduring firmness, of proud elevation of soul, than was exhibited during the last hours of this "untutored savage." His character has already given beauty to the page of the historian; and it will, in future time, furnish to the poet who can fully comprehend and delineate it, a rich and inspiring theme.

To those who are fully acquainted with the historical narrative on which the following poem is founded, it perhaps need not be said, that the most characteristic expressions in the language, which in the latter, is attributed to the hero, are

words which are recorded as having been actually uttered by him. These are given as literally as it was possible to give them in a metrical composition.

The last great battle had been fought,
The fatal strife was o'er,
And the haughty Narragansett power
Had sunk to rise no more.

The bravest warriors of the tribe
In death were cold and low,
And its proud hopes, and gathered might
Had perished at a blow.

The old, the mother with her babe,
The wounded and the weak,
Had left their spoiled and wasted land
Another home to seek.

Through forests heaped with drifted snow
That weary band had passed,
With wasting strength till they had found
A resting place at last.

And there, around the council fire,
The nation's aged men,
In sad and sorrowful debate,
Once more were gathered then.

Long had they sat, the winter's night
Was drawing to a close,
When in the midst their noble chief,
The young Canonchet rose.

"Fathers, I've listened to your talk;
Your words are good," he said;
"But words of council will not give
My hungry people bread.

Our women cry aloud for food,
I hear them night and morn,
And in our baskets there is not
A single ear of corn.

We have no seed to plant the ground
Around our cabins here;
How shall my famished people live
Through all the coming year?

Fathers! Before the sun shall rise,
Canonchet must be gone,
To ask the Wampanoags to give
His starving people corn.

The English warriors are before,
The Pequots are behind;
But the Great Spirit for his feet,
A ready path will find."

The word was said; the Council rose;
And ere the morrow's dawn
Upon his brave and daring task
The youthful chief had gone.

And with quick eye and heedful step,
Throughout the toilsome day,
Kept through the trackless wilderness
His solitary way.

At length in view, beside his path,
A friendly cabin rose;
And there he entered wearily,
For shelter and repose.

But scarcely had a watch been set
His resting place around,
When from the hill above was heard
A low and warning sound.

And then a shout, a rush of feet,
A wild and hurried cry,
"The bloodhounds are upon the track,
The English foe is nigh!"

He heard that sound, that cry — and like
A lion from his den,
Made, with a giant's strength, his way
Through a host of armed men.

Then came the word for hot pursuit,
The answer quick and short,
The dry leaves crash 'neath the flying feet
And the musket's sharp report.

He darts through the brushwood, he springs through the brake,
The earth gives no sound to his tread;
But when e'er for an instant he turns on his heel,
His foremost pursurer is dead.

Across the wide valley and o'er the steep hill,
Like an arrow just loosed from the string;
As if in the speed of his flight he would vie
With the bullets around him that sing.

His eye is on fire, every sinew is strained,
His bosom is panting for breath;
But each time that the fire flashes forth from his gun,
It carries a message of death.

His foes are gathering fast behind,
He feels his failing strength;
But onward strains until he gains
A river's bank at length.

Where the deep Seekonk's winter's stream,
Like a cloud of feathery snow,
From the wave worn edge of the river cliffs,
Rolls down to its bed below.

The eager host rush wildly on —
Where is the warrior — where?
Beside the swollen river's brink —
Why stands he silent there?

With firm set foot and folded arms,
He views his coming foes;
But heedless sees the gathering crowd
That fast around him close.

"Now yield thee, Narragansett," cried
The youngest of the band;
The captive slowly turns his head,
And proudly waved his hand.

"You are a child; — for war
You are too young and weak;
Go, let your chief or father come,
And I to him will speak."

Then silently he turns to gaze
With fixed unmoving eyes,
Where stained with blood, and blacked with smoke,
His useless musket lies.

To seize their unresisting foe
None yet among them dare,
For his proud bearing overawes
The bravest spirit there.

That he now stands within their grasp
Can hardly gain belief;
Is this Canonchet — can it be
The dreaded Indian Chief?

" It is Canonchet that you see,
Let every one come near,
And listen, that you all may know
What brought the Sachem here.

You burned my people's villages,
And quenched the fire with blood;
My tribe were driven forth to starve,
I sought to bring them food.

I came to find them corn to plant,
To save the wasting lives
Of all our helpless, weak, old men,
Our children, and our wives.

Unhurt I passed your warriors though,
Your crowded warpaths passed
Until you tracked me to the bank
Of this deep stream at last.

I sprang among the hidden rocks,
To gain the other side;
I slipped, and with my gun I fell,
And sank beneath the tide.

Canonchet's aim is very true,
He can outrun the deer;
And to a Narragansett Chief,
Who ever spoke of fear?

But when he found that he had wet
The powder in his horn,
His heart was like a rotten stick,
And all its strength was gone.

He had no hatchet in his belt,
He could not fire his gun,
Then he stood still — because he knew
That his last fight was done.

The Narragansett's bow is broke;
The nation's power is dust;
Its Sachem stands a captive here,
And you may do your worst.

All whom he loved are dead and gone,
His people's hour is nigh,
Let all the white men load their guns;
Canonchet wants to die."

"Thy prayer is vain; the punishment
Our righteous laws decree
To rebels and to murderers,
Must be the doom for thee.

Thou to the white men's council fire,
A prisoner must repair;
And there thou must abide the fate
Which justice will declare.

But send back now thy messengers,
And let there forth be brought
The Wampanoag fugitives
Who thy protection sought.

They were thy nation's enemies;
Let them thy ransom be;
Deliver them unto our hands,
And thou again art free."

"No, not one Wampanoag, no!
My promise shall not fail;
Not one, no, nor the paring of
A Wampanoag nail!"

He threw a bitter glance of scorn
Upon the throng around;
And stilled was every motion there,
And hushed was every sound.

"'Tis good; the Sachem then will die;
He understands it all;
His spirit hears it and is glad;
He's ready when you call.

He's glad, because he'll die before
His heart grows soft and weak;
Before he speaks a single word
Which he ought not to speak.

The Sachem does not want to talk;
His answer you have heard;
No white man from Canonchet's lips
Shall hear another word."

Around his tall and manly form,
He wrapped his mantle then;
And with a proud and silent step,
Went with those armed men.

The third day when the sun had set,
The deed of guilt was o'er;
And a cry of woe was borne along
The Narragansett shore.

Through the Narragansett land, a cry
Of wailing and of pain,
Told that its Chief, by English hands,
Was captured and was slain.

He bore the trial and the doom,
Scorn, insults, and the chain;
But no man, to his dying hour,
E'er heard him speak again.

A ROAD DAMAGE.

The price to every man here under subscribed is as to their several names annexed, is allowed by us, the Jurors, for land taken from them for country roads already laid out by us and the damage thereon accruing.

To Nicholas Gardiner,	£2, 10s.
" Samuel Watson,	£6, 00
" Benjamin Congdon,	£10, 00
" Capt. Lodowick Updike,	£10, 00
For the hummock by the watering place,	
To John Briggs,	£5, 00
And the old highway that is to lay the bog adjoining to him,	£33, 10s.

To Henry Knowles the remaining part of the highway to the north and east of his land. Laid way to be and remain six rods broad. He allowed remainder of said highway he is to have in lieu of the land taken from him and the highway laid out by us.

And upon further consideration we do order and allow ye highway to ye eastward of within mentioned Benjamin Congdon, shall be and remain eight rods wide, and the remainder of said highway on the west side of said highway from the house that was built by James Congdon, and so on to extend westward until it meets with the fence or line that is between the said Benjamin

Congden and the land that was his brothers, James Congden's, to lie and remain to him, the said Benjamin Congden, his heirs and assigns forever.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands this 10th day of February, 1715-16.

	Joseph Smith, <i>Foreman</i> ,	
Alexander Huling,	Samuel Weight,	Jonathan Turner,
Samuel Perry,	Ichabod Sheffield,	Jos. Sheffield,
Benoni Sweet,	George Thomas,	Samuel Helme,
Jeremiah Clarke,	Job Babcock,	Abiel Sherman.

A LIST OF THE BIRTHS OF SOUTH
KINGSTOWN, R. I.

From Records in Town Clerk's Office.

CONTRIBUTED BY THE EDITOR.

(Continued from page 137.)

O.

Oatley Samuel, of Jonathan,			Oct. 23, 1726.
" Rebecca,	"		Sept. 10, 1728.
" Rhoda,	"		Dec. 29, 1730.
" Benedict,	"		Dec. 25, 1732.
" Joseph,	"		Mar. 14, 1739.
O'Neil Abbie Randall, of James and Mary,			Jan. 18, 1851.
" Mary Ann,	"	"	April 8, 1853.
" Susan,	"	"	Dec. 19, 1858.
" James Daniel,	"	"	Sept. 2, 1861.
Osborne Hannah, of Nathaniel and Hannah,			Aug. 23, 1703.
" Nathaniel,	"	"	Nov. 20, 1708.
" William,	"	"	Sept. 30, 1711.
" Ann,	"	"	Sept. 13, 1714.
" John,	"	"	Dec. 30, 1715.
" Abigail,	"	"	Feb. 25, 1718-9.
" Joseph,	"	"	May 31, 1724.

P.

Pitman Sarah Ann, of George B. and Peggy D.,	Dec. 19, 1815.
Peckham Peleg, of Benjamin and Mary,	June 28, 1723.
“ Joseph, “ “	Jan. 14, 1725-6.
“ Isaac, “ “	Dec. 23, 1728.
“ Mary, “ “	May 28, 1730.
“ George Hazard, “ “	April 14, 1733.
“ Timothy, “ “	July 19, 1737.
“ Josephus, “ “	Feb. 21, 1742.
“ Peleg, “ “	Jan. 11, 1762.
“ Sarah, of William and Mercy,	Nov. 28, 1777.
“ Alice, “ “	Jan. 19, 1780.
“ William, “ “	Nov. 11, 1781.
“ Mercy, “ “	July 11, 1783.
“ Dorcas, “ “	Feb. 7, 1787.
“ Perry, “ “	June 30, 1789.
“ Elizabeth, “ “	Nov. 9, 1792.
“ Elizabeth, of Peleg, Jr., and Desire (N. K.)	July 25, 1786.
“ Rufus Wheeler, of Peleg, Jr., and Desire (N. K.)	Sept. 27, 1789.
“ Peleg Brown, of Peleg, Jr., and Desire (N. K.)	July 17, 1792.
“ George, of Peleg, Jr., and Desire (N. K.)	Feb. 24, 1796.
“ Mary, of William and Mary, *	Aug. 27, 1795.
“ Josephus, of Josephus and Mary,	May 26, 1788.
“ George, “ “	Feb. 15, 1785.
“ William Robinson, “ “	July 4, 1791.
“ Hannah, “ “	May 17, 1795.
“ Susannah Stanton, of William and Susannah,	Jan. 3, 1804.
“ Sarah, of William and Susannah,	June 23, 1805.
“ Benjamin, “ “	Nov. 18, 1806.
“ William Stanton, “ “	Sept. 22, 1808.
“ Mercy Perry, “ “	April 29, 1810.

Peckham Dorcas,	of William and Susannah,	June 5, 1812.
" Jane Hazard,	" "	June 8, 1814.
" George Hazard,	" "	Feb. 18, 1816.
" James Perry,	" "	March 25, 1819.
" Edwin Alexander,	" "	Dec. 10, 1820.
" John Cross,	" "	Nov. 30, 1822.
" Alice Rathbone,	" "	March 8, 1826.
" Carder,	of Benjamin and Mary,	Jan. 22, 1800.
" Henry Waud,	" "	July 22, 1804.
" Renewed,	" "	Jan. 19, 1805.
" Edward Hazard,	of George and Elizabeth,	Jan. 2, 1809.
Perry Benjamin,	of Benjamin and Susannah,	Nov. 7, 1729.
" Edward,	" "	March 28, 1731.
" Freeman	" "	Jan. 23, 1733.
" Mary,	" "	Nov. 19, 1735.
" Mercy,	of James and Mary,	Feb. 24, 1754.
" Anna,	" "	March 16, 1756.
" James,	" "	May 26, 1758.
" William,	" "	June 19, 1759.
" John,	" "	July 28, 1760.
" John,	of John and Hannah,	Aug. 7, 1784.
" Robert N.,	of John B. and Susan,	Dec. 27, 1805.
" Susan,	" "	March 16, 1810.
" John B.,	" "	Feb. 14, 1814.
Perkins Nathaniel,	of Nathaniel and Elizabeth,	Jan. 1, 1739.
" Susannah,	" "	Jan. 13, 1742.
" Elizabeth,	" "	Dec. 25, 1745.
" Abraham,	" "	March 9, 1747-8.
" William,	" "	Nov. 20, 1754.
" Sands,	" "	May 12, 1757.
" James,	" "	March 13, 1760.
" Jenckes,	" "	"
" Ebenezer,	of Edward and Elizabeth,	April 4, 1741.
" Ann,	" "	May 19, 1743.
" Brenton,	" "	March 23, 1745.

Perkins	Edward,	of Edward and Elizabeth,	May 20, 1747.
"	Joseph,	" "	Sept. 24, 1749.
"	Abram,	" "	Jan. 19, 1752.
"	Hannah,	" "	Nov. 19, 1753.
"	Benjamin,	" "	Feb. 7, 1756.
Phillips	Joseph,	of Bartholomew and Mary,	Aug. 11, 1703.
"	Elizabeth,	" "	Sept. 10, 1705.
"	Mary,	" "	Feb. 7, 1710.
"	Abigail,	of Joseph and —	Jan. 26, 1729.
"	Dorcas,	" "	Dec. 15, 1731.
"	Bartholomew,	" "	Nov. 10, 1734.
"	Joseph,	" "	May 8, 1737.
Pollock	John W.,	of Wm. Wilson and Mary,	March 28, 1785.
"	Samuel Holden,	of William and Lydia,	Sept. 28, 1787.
"	Sally S.,	of Sam'l Holden and Sarah,	Oct. 27, 1809.
"	Abbie C.,	" "	April 14, 1811.
"	Simon S.,	" "	April 11, 1813.
Potter	Rouse,	of Ichabod and Margaret,	Feb. 13, 1702-3.
"	William,	" "	March 4, 1709.
"	Margaret,	" "	Oct. 11, 1714.
"	Samuel,	of John and Sarah,	July 28, 1715.
"	William,	of John and Mercy,	Jan. 21, 1722-3.
"	Samuel,	" "	Jan. 20, 1724-5.
"	Mercy,	" "	Aug. 15, 1727.
"	Sarah,	" "	Aug. 11, 1730.
"	John,	of Ichabod and Sarah,	July 29, 1724.
"	Simeon,	" "	Sept. 25, 1726.
"	Ruth,	" "	Jan. 19, 1727-8.
"	Rouse,	" "	Dec. 10, 1729.
"	Joseph,	of John son of Thomas,	Sept. 24, 1724.
"	Benjamin,	" "	Sept. 24, 1724.
"	Mary,	" "	Feb. 4, 1726.
"	Robert,	of Ichabod and Deborah,	Nov. 26, 1726-7.
"	Elizabeth,	" "	Dec. 18, 1728.
"	Deborah,	" "	Feb. 15, 1732.
"	Ichabod,	" "	Sept. 13, 1734.

Potter Ruth,	of Benjamin and Ruth,	Nov. 8, 1728.
" Thomas Benjamin,	" "	March 8, 1732.
" Lydia,	" "	Sept. 13, 1734.
" Joshua, of Joseph and Abigail,		March 7, 1730-1.
" Abigail,	" "	Jan. 7, 1732.
" Robert, of Robert and Judith,		March 6, 1732.
" Martha,	" "	May 15, 1736.
" Hannah,	" "	Aug. 24, 1738.
" William,	" "	Jan. 5, 1742.
" Judith,	" "	July 16, 1745.
" Rouse,	" "	Jan. 3, 1748.
" Elizabeth,	" "	Oct. 3, 1750.
" Marberry,	" "	June 17, 1753.
" Samuel,	" "	March 6, 1757.
" Christopher, of Ichabod (of Ichabod) and Sarah,		Nov. 15, 1732.
" Nicholas, of Ichabod (of Ichabod) and Sarah,		Aug. 31, 1735.
" Mary, of Ichabod (of Ichabod) and Sarah,		Sept. 26, 1737.
" Thomas, of Ichabod (of Robert) and Margaret,		July 2, 1738.
" William, of Ichabod (of Robert) and Margaret,		Nov. 14, 1739.
" Margaret, of Ichabod (of Robert) and Margaret,		June 11, 1743.
" Mercy,	of William and Penelope,	Nov. 26, 1741.
" Thomas Hazard	" "	Dec. 8, 1753.
" Alice,	" "	April 20, 1756.
" Susannah,	" "	April 25, 1758.
" William Robinson,	" "	July 13, 1760.
" Benedict Arnold,	" "	Sept. 12, 1761.
" Penelope,	" "	March 7, 1764.
" William Pitt,	" "	April 10, 1766.
" Edward,	" "	Feb. 15, 1768.
" Simeon,	" "	April 25, 1770.

Potter Sarah,	of William and Penelope,	Dec. 13, 1771.
" John,	" "	May 24, 1774.
" Pelham,	" "	Dec. 7, 1776.
" Mary, of Benjamin and Margaret,		Jan. 2, 1747-8.
" Susannah, of Thomas, Jr., and Elizabeth,		Aug. 21 1759.
" Margaret,	" "	May 23, 1761.
" Thomas,	" "	Dec. 2, 1762.
" Elisha Reynolds,	" "	Nov. 5, 1764.
" Asa,	" "	Sept. 4, 1766.
" Elizabeth,	" "	June 21, 1770.
" Peggy,	" "	May, 1778.
" Benjamin, of William and Lydia,		Aug. 20, 1763.
" James of Ichabod and Deborah,		July. 26, 1764.
" Robert, of William (of Robert) and Mary,		Dec. 28, 1766.
" Stephen, of Stephen and Abigail,		May 31, 1775.
" John, of George and Sarah,		March 25, 1789.
" Alice, of John and Mary,		April 8, 1792.
" William, " "		March 4, 1794.
" Mary, " "		Aug. 30, 1795.
" Elisha Reynolds, Elisha R. and Mary,		June 20, 1811.
" Thomas, " "		May 4, 1813.
" Thomas Mawney, " "		Aug. 12, 1814.
" William Henry, " "		Nov. 2, 1816.
" James B. Mason, " "		Oct. 1, 1818.
" Mary Elizabeth, " "		Aug. 11, 1820.
" James H., of Frederic A. and Esther,		Oct. 28, 1850.
" Sarah A., of Frederic A and Anna A.		Aug. 31, 1853.
Powers Samuel Hoxie, of Sam'l and Anne.		June 2, 1785.
" Mary, " "		April 20, 1787.
" Martha. " "		June 4, 1789.
" Annie, " "		June 29, 1791.

R.

Record Virtue, of John and Deborah,		May 19, 1746.
Reynolds Elizabeth, of Elisha and Susannah,		June 30, 1729.
" Mary, " "		April 11, 1731.

Reynolds Ichabod, of Elisha and Susannah,	Sept. 5, 1732.
“ Susannah, “ “	May 16, 1734.
“ Elizabeth, “ “	Sept. 11, 1737.
“ Henry, “ “	Oct. 13, 1741.
“ Sarah, “ “	Nov. 9, 1748.
“ Benjamin, of Job and Abigail,	Sept. 5, 1746.
“ Abigail, “ “	Nov. 27, 1749.
“ Phebe, “ “	March 20, 1731.
“ George, “ “	Oct. 7, 1753.
“ Mary, “ “	Aug. 31, 1760.
“ Alice, of Henry and Mary,	April 17, 1749.
“ Sarah, “ “	March 28, 1751.
“ Stephen, of John and Abigail,	Dec. 5, 1749.
“ Henry, “ “	July 23, 1751.
“ Mary, “ “	April 20, 1753.
“ Elisha, of Henry and Mary,	April 19, 1762.
“ Sarah, “ “	June 29, 1764.
“ Mary, “ “	Oct. 18, 1766.
“ James, “ “	Jan. 7, 1769.
“ Thomas, “ “	Jan. 13, 1771.
“ Henry, “ “	Jan. 13, 1774.
“ Jessie, “ “	April 1, 1780.
“ Lydia, of Lydia Seerant, of Col. Elisha,	Aug. 24, 1773.
“ Jennie, “ “	April 14, 1775.
“ Nancy, “ “	March 21, 1777.
Rhodes Annie, of James and Annie,	Oct. 20, 1755.
“ Joseph, “ “	Sept. 10, 1758.
Robbins Thomas, of Thomas and Elizabeth,	Oct. 6, 1771.
Robinson Rowland, of William and Martha,	Oct. 8, 1719.
“ John, “ “	July 23, 1721.
“ Marah, “ “	Jan. 27, 1722-3.
“ Elizabeth, “ “	June 16, 1724.
“ Martha, “ “	Nov. 11, 1725.
“ Christopher, of William and Abigail,	Dec. 31, 1727.
“ William, “ “	Aug. 1, 1729.
“ Mary, “ “	Oct. 8, 1736.

Robinson James,	of William and Abigail,	Dec. 31, 1738.
" John,	" "	Jan. 13, 1742-3.
" Christopher,	" "	Dec. 31, 1747.
" Hannah, of Rowland and Anstis,		May 10, 1740.
" Mary,	" "	Aug. 15, 1751.
" William,	" "	Sept. 13, 1758.
" Hannah, of William and Sarah,		Feb. 21, 1751.
" Abigail,	" "	Aug. 24, 1753.
" Phillip,	" "	Oct. 6, 1755.
" James, of Sylvester and Alice,		Oct. 3, 1756.
" William,	" "	Dec. 20, 1760.
" Abigail, of Christopher and Ruhamah,		Jan. 20, 1755.
" Christopher,	" "	Nov. 26, 1756.
" George,	" "	Aug. 3, 1758.
" Elizabeth,	" "	June 14, 1760.
" Benjamin, of John and Sarah,		Aug. 5, 1763.
" Sarah,	" "	Dec. 10, 1764.
" William,	" "	April 25, 1766.
" John,	" "	Dec. 16, 1767.
" Sylvester,	" "	July 12, 1769.
" Thomas,	" "	May 5, 1771.
Rodman Thomas, of Thomas and Catherine,		March 9, 1707.
" Patience,	" "	March 22, 1709-10.
" John,	" "	Dec. 26, 1711.
" Joseph,	" "	Oct. 1, 1713.
" Samuel,	" "	March 22, 1716.
" Ann,	" "	April 20, 1718.
" Robert,	" "	June 11, 1720.
" William,	" "	May 3, 1723.
" Joseph, of Joseph and Tabitha,		March 23, 1733.
" Mary,	" "	Feb. 7, 1736.
" John,	" "	March 24, 1737.
" Thomas,	" "	July 1, 1740.
" Benjamin,	" "	July 22, 1726.
" Hannah, wife of Benjamin,		Oct. 26, 1723.
" Catherine, of Benjamin and Hannah,		Dec. 29, 1753.

Rodman Mary, of Benjamin and Hannah,	Dec. 16, 1755.
" Anne, " "	Dec. 11, 1757.
" Luceanna, " "	April 28, 1760.
" Ruth, " "	Aug. 12, 1763.
" Deborah, " "	Aug. 5, 1766.
" Isaac P., eldest son of Samuel and Mary,	Aug. 18, 1822.
" Sally, his wife, daughter of Lemuel H. Arnold,	Feb. 25, 1826.
" Isaac P., of Isaac P. and Sally,	April 21, 1848.
" Sally Lyman, " "	Feb. 10, 1850.
" Mary Peckham, " "	March 25, 1852.
" Samuel, " "	Feb. 6, 1854.
" Thomas, " "	March 23, 1856.
" Samuel, " "	April 11, 1858.
" Elizabeth Arnold, " "	July 24, 1860.
Rose Samuel, of John and Elizabeth,	Oct. 21, 1734.
" Abigail, " "	July 1, 1736.
" Thomas, " "	Jan. 30, 1739.
" John, " "	June 13, 1742.
" James, " "	Dec. 19, 1744.
" Phebe, " "	Dec. 4, 1746.
" Phillip, " "	Dec. 11, 1748.
" Stephen, " "	March 1, 1750.
" Mary E., of George P. and Harriet P.,	Sept. 3, 1853.
" George A., " "	July 25, 1856.
" Thomas, " "	Dec. 3, 1858.
Rogers Mary, of James and Mary,	Jan. 20, 1743.

(To be continued.)

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF RHODE ISLAND.—This church was established in Burrillville, and was formed Dec. 15, 1812, with Elder John Colby as pastor. It was organized with nine members. The first church meeting was held Feb. 11, 1813. The first quarterly meeting was held here, March 12, 1814, in the old Burrillville meeting-house.

THE STORY OF THE TABLETS.

III.

CONTRIBUTED BY JAMES L. SHERMAN, ESQ., PROVIDENCE, R. I.

From the North Burial Ground, Providence.

In Memory of
JOHN JENCKS, Esq.,
who departed this Life
January 2d, 1791,
Aged 61 Years.
Suffice it to say
That he was,
A Firm Patriot,
A Sincere Friend,
A Real Christian, and
An Honored Man.
Mark the perfect Man, and behold
The upright, for the end of
That Man is Peace.

In Memory of
MRS. FREELOVE JENCKES,
The Amiable Consort
of
John Jenckes, Esq.
She died on the 18th Day of June,
Anno Domini MDCCLXXX,
In the 42nd Year of Her Age.
She was of Honorable Descent, and
In her shone conspicuous
Piety and Benevolence.
With such other Virtues and Graces,
As exalt and adorn Human Nature.
She was given to Hospitality,
And the Poor daily experienced
Her liberality.

Above all she was a sincere Christian,
And died in the blessed Faith and Hope
of a glorious immortality
through Jesus Christ
Our Lord.

In Memory
of

JOANNA JENCKS,

Consort of the late
Daniel Jencks, Esq.

A Woman truly respectable & worthy
of imitation so long as the
Filial, Maternal or Conjugal Character
well supported are held in affection.

A Member of a Christian Church in the
Town of Providence more than 50 years,
which Church she adorned by her steady
Firm Faith, her humility, sobriety & Piety.
She was well-known for her
general benevolence, she was
equally distinguished for her diffusive
Beneficence.

As she lived, so she died,
a Christian filled with those hopes which
the Gospel of Christ only can inspire.
Obit 13th March, A. D., 1796,
Ætatis 92 Years and 3 Months.

In Memory of
the

Reverend STEPHEN GANO,

Pastor of the First Baptist Church
in Providence,
who departed this life, August 18,
A. D. 1828

in the 42d year of his ministry,
and 66th of his age.

As a Preacher,
he was evangelical, devout and impressive.

As a Pastor
faithful and vigilant :
In the duties of private life, exemplary.
His sound Judgement,
mild and conciliating manners :
fidelity in friendship :
integrity of heart :
ardent and enlightened piety :
and indefatigable labors in the cause of
Christianity,
have left indelible impressions
on all who knew him.
“ This Memory of the Just is Blessed.”

In Memory of
the

REVEREND JAMES MANNING, D.D.,
President
of Rhode Island College.

He was born in New Jersey, A. D. 1738 ;
Became a Member of a Baptist Church, A. D. 1758 ;
Graduated at Nassau Hall, A. D. 1762 ;
Was ordained a Minister of the Gospel, A. D. 1763 ;
Obtained a Charter for the College, A. D. 1765 ;
Was elected President of it the same year ;
And was a member of Congress, A. D. 1786.

His person was graceful,
And his countenance remarkably expressive,
of sensibility, cheerfulness and dignity.
The variety and excellence of his natural abilities,
Improved by education & enriched by science,
Raised him to a rank of eminence among literary
Characters.

His manners were engaging, his voice harmonious,

His eloquence natural and powerful,
His social virtues, classic learning, eminent patriotism,
Shining talents for instructing & governing youth,
And zeal in the cause of Christianity,
Are recorded on the tablets of many hearts.
He died of an Apoplexy, July 29, A. D. 1791,
Ætat. 53.

The Trustees and Fellows of the College
Have erected this Monument.

G. ALLEN, Sculp. Jan., 1793.

In Memory of
MRS. EUNICE PECK,
Wife of
Col. William Peck
of Providence,
and Daughter of
Capt. George and Mrs. Wailhill
Corlis.

She died the Twenty-sixth Day
of April *Anno Domini*
One Thousand, Seven Hundred
and Eighty-four,
In the Twenty-ninth Year
of her Age.

She's gone ; she's pass the gloomy shades of Night.

Sacred
to the Memory of
MRS. PHEBE P. BARKER,
the beloved and affectionate wife of
Col. William C. Barker,
and third daughter of
Mr. Isaac & Mrs. Phebe Peck :
She was born the 23d day of Nov., 1797,
and departed this life on the 1st day
of July, A. D. 1827.
While memory holds a seat, the

cherished remembrance of
her virtues will live in the
heart of her relatives and
friends, and the tender
recollections of her
unspotted life, operate
as a linient balm to
their lacerated
feelings.

Also PHEBE ANN,
daughter of
Col. Wm. C. & Mrs. Phebe P. Barker,
Died June 27th, 1827,
Aged 7 days.

Sacred to the Memory of
COL. JEREMIAH OLNEY.
A Patriot Soldier of the Revolution.
Late Collector of the Customs for the District
of Providence,
and President of the Society of Cincinnati
of the State of Rhode Island
and Providence Plantations.
He closed his honorable and useful Life,
with Christian Serenity,
on the 10th day of November, 1812,
in the 63d year of his Age.
As a Citizen
he was virtuous and public-spirited.
As an Officer
he was ardent, judicious and intrepid.
The unqualified Approbation
of Washington, his immortal Chief,
is a Demonstration of his Worth,
which will transmit his Name
in the Annals of his Country
with Reputation

to Posterity.
To his natural elevation of Soul
were signally united
the purest Honour and Integrity,
from which no Interest could swerve,
No Danger appal him.
His Conscience was his Monitor,
Truth and Justice were his Guides.
Hospitality and Benevolence
were conspicuous Traits in his Character,
and his Relatives and Friends,
will cherish the Remembrance of his Virtues
while Memory holds a seat.

The Grave of
JOSEPH L. TILLINGHAST,
Counsellor-at-Law,
Born in Taunton, Massachusetts,
1790.
Died in Providence
Dec. 31, 1844.
He was for ten years a Representative
from this city in the General Assembly
of Rhode Island; and for six years, a
Representative from this state in the
Congress of the United States.
In silence and in hope
he rests.

Also
Sacred to the Memory of
REBECCA POWER,
his wife,
interred at Georgetown, D. C.,
where she died October 18,
1860.

This frail Memorial
is the last sad Tribute of
Affection to the Memory of
MISS SARAH ANN OLNEY,
Daughter of the late
Col. Christopher Olney.
She departed this Life the
16th Day of April, A. D. 1815.
Aged 30 Years.

While Memory holds a seat, the
cherished Remembrance of her
Virtues will live in the Hearts
of her Relatives and Friends,
and the tender Recollection
of her unspotted Life
operate as a Leinint
Balm to their lacerated
Feelings.

Here repose the remains
of
CHRISTOPHER C. OLNEY,
who on the 12th day of April,
A. D. 1809,
in the 36th year of his Age,
surrendered his soul to God,
in the full hope of a glorious
resurrection through the
merits of his Redeemer.
His Brother Nathaniel G. Olney,
as a tribute of his affection,
has erected this stone.
The brilliant star of faith arose and shed
Celestial comfort on the dying bed.

Sacred to the Memory of
MR. JAMES HUNNIMAN OLNEY,
son of Col. Christopher Olney &

Mrs. Minah his wife,
born April 7, A. D. 1767.

From his earliest youth
He was remarkably obedient & attentive
to his Parents,
kind & obliging to his relations & friends.

His person was graceful,
His manners, modest & unassuming,
conveying at once
an idea of an ingenious mind
and a feeling heart.

He sustained a fair moral character,
adorned with a display of those dispositions,
which endeared him to all his acquaintances.

He was educated a Merchant
was industrious, persevering & successful
in business,
till oppressed with a lingering disease,
which he bore with fortitude & resignation.

He closed his bright prospects,
and went out of the World
satisfied with the goodness of that God
who sent him into it,
& departed this life July 29, A. D. 1796,
in the 30th Year of his Age.

This frail Memorial
is the last sad tribute of
Affection to the Memory of
MRS. SARAH ANN OLNEY,
Daughter of the late
Col. Christopher Olney.
She departed this Life, the
16th Day of April, A. D. 1815.
Aged 30 Years.

While memory holds a seat, the
cherished remembrance of her
Virtues will live in the Hearts

of her relatives and friends,
and the tender recollection
of her unspotted Life
operate as a lenient
Balm to their
lacerated
Feelings.

IMPROVED ORDER OF RED MEN.

CONTRIBUTED BY FRED. J. SMITH, PROVIDENCE; R. I.

THIS organization, known as the Improved Order of Red Men, is a fraternal and benevolent institution, of purely American origin. The exact date of its origin is not known, as evidence can be traced back to a period previous to the Revolution. But documents in possession of the Great Council of the United States, tell us that in the year 1813, a society of Red Men was formed at Fort Mifflin, on the Delaware River, then garrisoned by American troops; after peace was declared, members of the society became widely scattered, but being much impressed with the customs and habits, also the pleasant memories of its existence, formed new Societies, under the same laws and with the same intentions of the Society at Fort Mifflin. In the year 1835 we find many council fires kindled throughout the country, and in May of the same year, delegates from different jurisdictions convened at Baltimore, and adopted substantially the Ritual, Laws, and Regulations that govern it to-day. Since which time the organization is known as the Improved Order of Red Men. Its growth has been slow but sure, until now nearly every State in the Union contains Tribes and Great Councils, in full fellowship with the Great Council of the United States. The order is founded on the

manners and customs of the Indian Race, and its Ritual perpetuates the memory of the forms and religious ceremonies peculiar to that unfortunate people. They believe in a Great Spirit who governs the world, so any one joining this Order must declare his belief in the Great Spirit, the Creator and Preserver of the universe. The subordinate branches or primary assemblies of the Order are denominated Tribes. The Ritual is divided into four Degrees: Adoption, Hunter's, Warrior's and Chief's; and for beauty and originality they are unsurpassed. The Supreme Body of a State is known by the title of Great Council, and the Supreme Body over all as the Great Council of the United States. The forms, ceremonies and lectures used in the adoption of members and conferring of degrees are interesting and instructive, and free from anything frivolous or disagreeable. The meetings are held for the transaction of business of a moral, benevolent and charitable character, and everything partaking of levity, or political or sectarian tendencies, is excluded therefrom.

Its objects are to promote among men the exercise and practice of the true principles of benevolence and charity; the care and protection of the Widow and Orphans and the cultivation of friendly relations among mankind, in short the Motto—"Freedom, Friendship and Charity"—indicates quite clearly the objects and aim of the Brotherhood, whilst the preservation from oblivion of much that relates to one of the declining Races of mankind, and which will prove interesting to the student and antiquarian, may not be considered unimportant results of the organization, and it now has an existance in more than thirty-five jurisdictions; in some of these it equals the strongest of kindred societies in zeal and prosperity, and in many of them has a nucleus both healthy and promising.

The Order is not very strong in the Eastern States. It was first introduced into Rhode Island on the 4th day of September, 1871, at which time instituted King Philip Tribe No. 1, at Olneyville, when the following Chiefs were

raised up to their respective stumps: Sachem, Sr. Sagamore, Jr. Sagamore, Chief of Records, Keeper of Wampum, First Sanop, Second Sanop, Guard of the Wigwam, Guard of the Forest.

The Tribe increased rapidly in membership and in a very short time numbered over a hundred members.

Canonicus Tribe No. 2, of Phenix, also Miantonomah Tribe No. 3, of Providence, was instituted the following year. On the 5th day of August, 1872, Great Incohonie William B. Eckert, assisted by Morris H. Gorham, instituted the Great Council of the State at Miantonomah Wigwam No. 41, Weybossett Street, when the following Great Chiefs were raised up to their respective Stumps:

Great Prophet,	-	-	-	-	JOHN L. PERRIN.
Great Sachem,	-	-	-	-	W. V. SLOCUM.
Great Sr. Sagamore,	-	-	-	-	ANDREW MCKENZIE.
Great Jr. Sagamore,	-	-	-	-	N. R. TILTON.
Great Chief of Records,	-	-	-	-	H. B. WINSLOW.
Great Keeper of Wampom,	-	-	-	-	A. R. SHERMAN.
Great Sanop,	-	-	-	-	S. R. NICHOLAS.
Great Guard of Forest,	-	-	-	-	H. L. HOWARD.
Great Guard of Wigwam,	-	-	-	-	— — — —

Shortly after the institution of the Great Council the following Tribes were instituted:

Wampanoag No. 4, of Pawtucket; Narragansett No. 5, of Natick; and Red Jacket No. 6, of Newport. In 1874 Wamsutta Tribe No. 7, was instituted, but owing to the financial depression of the times they did not prosper, and in 1876 they surrendered their Charter to the Great Council.

There is six Tribes in the State at the present time (1878) with a membership of a little less than four hundred, the most prosperous of which is King Philip No. 1, of Providence, Canonicas No. 2, of Phenix, and Narragansett No. 5, of Natick.

The following are the present Great Chiefs of the Great Council of the State:

Great Prophet,	-	-	-	FRED. J. SMITH	No. 1.
Great Sachem,	-	-	-	HIRAM L. HOWARD	No. 4.
Great Sr. Sagamore,	-	-	-	H. C. BURDICK	No. 6.
Great Jr. Sagamore,	-	-	-	FRED A. KNIGHT	No. 3.
Great Chief of Records,	-	-	-	JOHN WELLS	No. 5.
Great Keeper of Wampum,	-	-	-	O. D. TILLINGHAST	No. 5.
Great Sanop,	-	-	-	JOHN GALLINGTON	No. 1.
Great Mishenawa,	-	-	-	A. E. SPENCER.	
Great Guard of Wigwam,	-	-	-	EARL FENNER.	
Great Guard of the Forest,	-	-	-	S. A. BALLOU.	

✓
**THE RECORD OF OLD SMITHFIELD FROM
1730 TO 1850.**

From Records in Town Clerk's Office, Lincoln.

CONTRIBUTED BY THE EDITOR.

(Continued from Vol. IV, page 113.)

F.

MARRIAGES.

- Fairbanks Joseph Orville, of James, and Rachel Hewitt, of Rhoda; m. by Rev. Wm. Verrinder, March 13, 1845.
- Fairbrother Elizabeth, or Esther, and Christopher Harris, April 15, 1753.
- Fairfield Skipper, and Rose Sly; m. by Thomas Sayles, justice, Sept. 1, 1736.
- Fales David G., and Parthenia C. Sprague; m. by Rev. David Pickering, May 3, 1829.
- Fanning John M., of Providence, and Amie Ann Miller, of Smithfield; m. by Rev. B. P. Byram, May 19, 1842.

Farnum Mary, and Silas Tuft, Jan. 26, 1748.

“ Moses, and Lucy Comstock ; m. by Thomas Arnold, justice, Dec. 17, 1752.

“ John, of Uxbridge, and Martha Comstock, of Smithfield, widow of Daniel, Jur. ; m. by Thomas Arnold, justice, Aug. 19, 1756.

“ Jonathan, of Uxbridge, and Urania Harris of Preserved, of Smithfield ; m. by Stephen Arnold, justice, Sept. 29, 1765.

“ Mary, and Capt. Wm. Waterman, Nov. 27, 1777.

“ Lydia, and Benjamin Tucker, Mar. 23, 1786.

“ Mary, and George Smith, March 11, 1804.

“ Lydia, and George Angel, Nov. 25, 1810.

“ John, of Noah, and Lydia Mathewson, of Joseph ; m. by Robert Harris, justice, Aug. 16, 1812.

“ Frelove, and Asahel Aldrich, April 10, 1817.

“ Ruth, and Daniel Mowry, 3d, Dec. 6, 1818.

“ Emily, and Henry S. Mansfield, Sept. 12, 1844.

Farrar Ellis, of Daniel F., and Sarah Chatterton, of Nathan C., both of England ; m. by Rev. T. A. Taylor, April 2, 1846.

“ Mary, and Joseph Hansom, Dec. 21, 1846.

“ William, of Dan., and Sarah Gill, of John ; m. by Rev. Bayles P. Talbot, — 1846.

Feathergill Mrs. Mary, and Jonathan Armitage Fifield, Nov. 11, 1743.

Felsh Walton, of Attleboro, Mass., and Lydia Inman, of Smithfield ; m. by Elijah Arnold, justice, June 7, 1815.

Feltus William H., and Olive L. Hill ; both of Danby, Vt. ; m. by Rev. David Andrews, Jan. 15, 1852.

Fenner Lydia A., and Isaac M. Sweet, March 18, 1849.

Ferent John Billings, and Julia Ann Latham ; m. Rev. Asel D. Cole, May 15, 1843.

Field Phebe, and George Bannister, Feb. 19, 1754.

“ Mary A., and Charles A. Scott, Dec. 2, 1844.

- Fifield Jonathan Armitage, and Mrs. Mary Feathergill; m.
by Thomas Sayles, justice, Nov. 11, 1743.
- Fisher Daniel, and Mary Pond; m. by William Arnold,
justice, Oct. 9, 1741.
- “ Joseph, and Rebecca Nason; m. by William Arnold,
justice, Sept. 8, 1746.
- “ Susan L., and David Buffinton; Dec. 24, 1840.
- Fish Mary, and Joseph Darling; Jan. 6, 1735-6.
- “ Ruth, and Samuel Hayward; July 13, 1743.
- “ Esther, and Ebenezer Albee; Feb. 28, 1750.
- “ Chloe, and Augustus Mowry, Nov. 30, 1780.
- Fisk Alvin E. A., of Smithfield, son of Willard, and Sarah
Ann Corey, of Cumberland, dau. of Christopher H.;
m. by Rev. Reuben Allen, July 5, 1840.
- “ Abbie Ann, and Benjamin Kingsley; May 6, 1849.
- “ Mrs. Jenette, and James Lawton, Apr. 22, 1850.
- “ Hopesey B., and Levi Phillips; July 4, 1850.
- Fitton John, and Martha Winterbottom; m. by Rev. Asel D.
Cole, Oct. 14, 1844.
- Fitts Elizabeth Ann, and Rev. Daniel Rounds; Apr. 1, 1840.
- Fletcher Matilda, and James F. Smith; Mar. 25, 1850.
- Flynn David, and Rachel Aldrich; m. by Thomas Arnold,
justice, Mar. 22, 1752.
- Force Elizabeth, and Benjamin Darling, July 28, 1735.
- Fords William, and Jemima Callum; m. by Thomas Lapham,
justice, Mar. 26, 1749.
- Ford William and Jemima Callum; m. by Thomas Lapham,
justice, Mar. 17, 1752.
- Follett Lewis, of Cumberland, son of George, and Rebecca
Mathewson, of Smithfield, dau. of Joseph; m. by
Thomas Man, justice, June 10, 1824.
- “ Leonard Jenckes, of Leonard, and Phebe H. Vallett,
of Wanton; m. by Simon A. Sayles, Nov. 24, 1842.
- “ James, and Mary A. Aldrich; m. by Rev. John Boy-
den, Jr., Apr. 16, 1845.
- Foot Abigail, and Daniel Cook; June 6, 1751.

- Foss Charles M., and Susan N. Miller ; m. by Rev. B. P. Byram, June 25, 1848.
- Foster Mary, and Joseph Clarke, Nov. 2, 1800.
- “ Samuel, and Angelina Arnold, of Olney ; m. by George F. Jenckes, justice, Apr. 23, 1843.
- Fowler John M., of Uxbridge, and Jane Burlingame, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. Reuben Allen, May 3, 1840.
- Freeman Willard, of Whipple, and Olive Wipen ; m. by Thos. Man, justice, Mar. 27, 1825.
- “ Margaret, and Benjamin Bartlett, Jan. 25, 1830.
- “ George Van Renssaleur, and Nacy V. Webb ; m. by Asa Winsor, justice, Dec. 28, 1834.
- “ Truman, Jr., of Providence, and Margaret Boyd, of Pawtucket, Mass. ; m. by Rev. B. P. Byram, Mar. 10, 1844.
- “ Amanda Melvina, and Daniel S. Clark, Apr. 5, 1846.
- “ Mary E., and Stephen Kimball, May 16, 1846.
- “ Lattice P., and Hiram B. Tucker, Nov. 29, 1847.
- “ Susan M., and Alfred Allen, May 3, 1848.
- Frinnecome Mary Ann, and William A. Brickell, Sept. 18, 1845.
- Frost Eliza, and Samuel Hixon, Jr., Dec. 22, 1846.
- Fry Hannah G., and William R. Johnson, Sept. 27, 1841.
- Fuller Barnabus S., of Smithfield, son of Hezekiah, of Hachniach, N. J., and Elizabeth Phillips ; m. by Thomas Man, justice, Sept. 4, 1823.
- “ Lorenzo D., of Zachariah, and Martha A. Greene ; m. by Ephraim Sayles, justice, Oct. 3, 1839.
- “ Thomas P., of Zechariah, and Robey Austin ; m. by Ephraim Sayles, justice, Oct. 25, 1840.
- “ Martha J., and Stephen P. Brown, Oct. 29, 1846.
- “ Candace C., and Nathaniel T. Arnold, Oct. 13, 1850.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

- Fales Elizabeth K., of David G. and Parthenia, Dec. 3, 1830.
- “ John R., “ “ Mar. 5, 1833.
- “ Geo. Stephens, “ “ Dec. 25, 1836.

Farnum Mary, of John and Martha,	Dec. 12, 1757.
" Rachel, " "	Nov. 14, 1759.
" Stephen, " "	Jan. 19, 1762.
" John, " "	June 14, 1764.
Fisk Annsilia, of Jonah and Sarah,	May 12, 1735.
" Jonah, " "	June 15, 1737.
Finch Hopestill, of Henry and Abigail,	Mar. 23, 1751.
" Stephen, " "	Mar. 6, 1754.
" Peter, " "	Oct. 8, 1756.
" Rebecca, " "	Sept. 11, 1758.
" Henry, " "	July 16, 1760.
Ford William, of William and Jemima,	Sept. 12, 1749.
" Jean, " "	Nov. 2, 1750.
" Ladoc, " "	Sept. 21, 1752.
" Richard, " "	Dec. 13, 1753.
" Joseph, " "	Aug. 18, 1755.
" Anne, " "	Apr. 21, 1757.
" Bathsheba, " "	Nov. 25, 1758.
" Richard, " "	Dec. 6, 1760.
" Prudence, " "	Jan. 8, 1763.
Frazer William J., of Wm. H. and Isabella,	May 9, 1845.
" John H., " "	Sept. 28, 1850.
" Isabella, wife of William H.,	died Oct. 14, 1852.
Freeman Thomas, son of Joshua, b. Barnard, Vt., d. Mar. 1,	
1848, aged 51 years, 11 months, 17 days.	
Fuller Ezekiel, of Ezekiel and Abigail,	Jan. 1, 1751.
" Isaiah, " "	Mar. 19, 1753.
" George, " "	Sept. 27, 1755.
" Abigail, " "	Dec. 29, 1757.
" Abigail, of William and Sarah,	Apr. 2, 1780.
" William, " "	Apr. 12, 1782.

G.

MARRIAGES.

Gage Joan, and Isaac Mathewson, May 30, 1840.

Gardiner Samuel E., and Alice Mowry, of Nathaniel ; m. by
Rev. Reuben Allen, Feb. 3, 1831.

- Gardiner William H., and Sarah H. Bradford ; m. at Mendon,
by Rev. Adin Ballou, Dec. 20, 1837.
- “ Nelson, and Jane Sayles ; m. by Nicholas S. Winsor,
justice, July 25, 1839.
- “ Vincent C., of Smithfield, and Mary Leach, of Cum-
berland ; m. by Rev. Wm. Verrinder, Oct. 7, 1844.
- “ Erastus G., of North Kingstown, age 25, son of
William H. and Patience, and Ann E. Sherman,
age 25, dau. of John B. and Ann E. of Pawtucket ;
m. by Rev. I. J. Burguess, Jan. 16, 1851.
- Gaskill Mary, and Adam Hautless, Dec. 28, 1741.
- “ Patience, and Jonathan Aldrich, Mar. 17, 1742-3.
- “ Libbeus, of Cumberland, and Philena S. Sawyer, of
Smithfield ; m. by Rev. John Borden, Jr., Oct. 19,
1841.
- “ William, of Smithfield, son of Edward, of Maidstone,
Vt. ; and Catherine Carr, of Ireland ; m. by Rev.
Junia S. Mowry, Feb. 17, 1850.
- Gavitt Lucy, and William P. Perkins, Aug. 1, 1839.
- Gee Henry, and Vesta Ann Randall ; m. by Rev. T. A. Tay-
lor, July 3, 1844.
- Gifford Farnum, of Seth, of Uxbridge, and Robey Brown, of
Seth, of Rehoboth, Mass. ; m. by Caleb Farnum,
justice, Aug. 31, 1815.
- “ Seth B. and Roxa Weatherhead ; m. by Rev. Leonard
Wakefield, Oct. 24, 1841.
- “ Elvina, and David Ellis, Feb. 28, 1848.
- Gile Joseph, and Tabitha Harris ; m. by Daniel Mowry, Jr.,
justice, Sept. 13, 1756.
- Gillis Mercy, and Moses Aldrich, Feb. 16, 1758.
- Gill Sarah, and William Farrar, —, 1846.
- Gilmore Sarah J. and Balsa Fisk Johnson, Jan. 26, 1843.
- “ Phebe B. and Albert Cook, Sept. 24, 1848.
- Glasié Isaac, of Jacob, of North Uxbridge, and Lucy Brayton,
of James of Smithfield ; m. by Elisha Arnold, justice,
Dec. 19, 1800.

- Gleason Urziel, of North Providence, and Emily Kelley, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. E. W. Porter, Sept. 29, 1846.
- “ Charles, and Mary Ann Gurley ; m. by Rev. Thomas C. Brown, July 2, 1848.
- Goff Sarah, and Henry Wright, May 1, 1848.
- Goldwaite Sarah, and Joseph Buxton, Feb. 10, 1752.
- “ Pelatiah, of John, and Charity Buxton, of James ; m. by Elijah Arnold, justice, Dec. 5, 1799.
- “ Sally, and Thomas S. Brown, Dec. 8, 1844.
- Gooding Susan M., and Thomas Bell, Oct. 30, 1848.
- Gore Mehitable, and William Maccavy, June 27, 1740.
- Gould William, of Burrillville, and Eliza Buxton ; m. by Rev. T. A. Taylor, Mar. 21, 1844.
- “ Mary D. and Henry Polsey, Nov. 11, 1747.
- Graff Philadelphia and James Peets, Aug. 1, 1793.
- Grant James, and Thankful Arnold ; m. by Rev. S. S. Bradford, Apr. 12, 1846.
- Grason William, of Richard, and Urania, of Scituate, dec., and Hannah Mowry, of Darius and Lydia, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. Warren Lincoln, May 14, 1850.
- Greenhalgh Mary, and William Prince, —, 1846.
- Greene Patience, and Welcome Arnold, Feb. 11, 1773.
- “ Mary, and Stephen Arnold, Jan. 5, 1783.
- “ Ruth, and Richard Buffum, Feb. 23, 1783.
- “ Amie, and Jonathan Ellet, July 27, 1783.
- “ Ebenezer, and Mary Jones ; m. by Ananias Mowry, justice, Oct. 2, 1808.
- “ Henry Peirce, and Nancy Chillson ; m. by Elijah Arnold, justice, Feb. 23, 1815.
- “ Martha A. and Lorenzo D. Fuller, Oct. 3, 1839.
- “ Sarah, and Joseph S. Whitman, Sept. 17, 1843.
- “ Benjamin P. and Lucy Ann Spencer ; m. by Rev. Edwin Leigh, Nov. 30, 1843.
- “ Minerva A. and Augustus Phillips, Jr., Nov. 29, 1846.
- “ Hannah A. and Champlin L. Watson, Feb. 6, 1848.

- Gross Samuel, of Henry, and Susan B. Ashton, of Samuel;
m. by Rev. Reuben Allen, June 29, 1840.
- Grosvenor Caroline Hall, and Rev. Timothy Alden Taylor,
Sept. 2, 1840.
- Guild Caroline M. and James E. Lewis, Dec. 3, 1846.
- “ Melinda Jane, and Wm. H. Bennett, July 8, 1849.
- Gulley Phebe, and Elisha Mowry, Jr., Jan. 28, 1757.
- “ Thomas, of Jonathan, and Mrs. Hannah Mowry, of
David; m. by Samuel Man, justice, Dec. 14, 1809.
- “ Sarah, and Simeon B. Razee, July 27, 1829.
- Gurley Mary Ann, and Charles Gleason, July 2, 1848.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

- Gaskill Levina, of Benjamin and Amie, Sept. 27, 1765.
- “ Joanna, “ “ Jan. 19, 1768.
- “ Ezekiel, “ “ Dec. 12, 1769.
- Gile Joab, of Joseph and Tabitha, Aug. 16, 1761.
- “ Dorcas, “ “ Nov. 27, 1763.
- “ Amie, “ “ Dec. 7, 1766.
- “ David, “ “ Mar. 16, 1770.
- Gleason Cynthia A., of Smithfield, b. Mar. 27, 1799; d. Aug.
3, 1847.
- Greene William, of Ebenezer and Mary, Aug. 27, 1809.
- “ Mary, “ “ Nov. 5, 1811.
- “ George, of Henry P. and Nancy, June 23, 1816.
- Gulley Stephen, of William and Martha, Feb. 9, 1731-2.
- “ Jonathan, “ “ Feb. 6, 1733.
- “ Christopher, “ “ Feb. 24, 1735.
- “ Phebe, “ “ Jan. 25, 1737.
- “ Mercy, “ “ Jan. 9, 1740.
- “ William, “ “ Mar. 2, 1743-4.
- “ Hannah, “ “ July 4, 1748.

H.

MARRIAGES.

- Hacker William, and Tabitha Clarke; m. by David Comstock,
justice, Aug. 10, 1740.

Hadley William E., of Providence, son of John of Cumberland, dec., and Lucinda Benson, of Providence, dau. of Aaron of Lodi, N. Y. ; m. by Rev. Wm. Verrinder, Apr. 13, 1845.

Hakes Mary, and Ebenezer Darling, Feb. 25, 1745.

Hallowell Richard, and Hannah Scholes ; m. by Rev. Warren Emerson, Mar. 1, 1848.

Hall Joshua, Jr., of Cumberland, and Susannah Sprague, of Smithfield ; m. by Thomas Lapham, justice, June 2, 1751.

“ Lucina, and Reuben Aldrich, May 6, 1802.

“ Mary, and John Dexter, May 11, 1806.

“ Delia, and Paris Richmond, Aug. 13, 1829.

Hames Aaron, son of Robert of Douglass, Mass., dec., and Lydia Walker, of Reuben ; m. by Peleg Arnold, justice, Feb. 17, 1785.

Hamond Parley, of Douglass, Mass., and Elizabeth B. Mansfield, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. Timothy A. Taylor, May 15, 1839.

“ Mary A. and William Brown, Dec. 16, 1844.

Ham Phebe J. and Joseph Wilkinson, Sept. 23, 1846.

“ George W. of Isaac L. of Lowell, Mass., and Diana Isis Steere, of Arnold, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. I. J. Burguess, Oct. 13, 1847.

Hancock Guy, of Mendon, Mass., and Rosanna Herker, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. Asel D. Cole, July 12, 1842.

Handon Mary W. and Edwin L. Smith, July 4, 1848.

Handy Kezia, and Simeon Harris, May 19, 1791.

“ Lucy, and Nicholas Harris, Aug. 10, 1797.

“ Waitey, and James Arnold, Aug. 10, 1826.

“ Mary E. and Simon Strange, July 4, 1841.

“ Jedidah, and Emer C. Smith, June 4, 1844.

“ Asabiah, and Hamilton P. Aldrich, July 8, 1844.

“ Benjamin W. and Lucy A. Stratford ; m. by Rev. Asel D. Cole, Mar. 4, 1845.

Handy Silas, of Cumberland, and Caroline Snow, of Smithfield; m. by Rev. C. H. Titus, Dec. 31, 1848.

" William H. of Mason H., and Emeline F. Arnold, of Alvira A., dec.; m. by Rev. T. A. Taylor, September 17, 1849.

Hanson Joseph, of John, and Mary Farrar, of Daniel; m. by Rev. B. P. Talbot, Dec. 31, 1846.

Harkinson Ellen, and John Pickford, May 20, 1849.

Harkness Rachel, and Hezekiah Thurber, Nov. 6, 1767.

" James T. and Julia A. Arnold; m. by Rev. Timothy A. Taylor, June 20, 1839.

Harriman Martha H. and Charles M. Lockwood, July 3, 1847.

Harrison Harriet M. and Jesse T. Mowry, Nov. 11, 1849.

Harris John, and Elizabeth King; m. by Thomas Sayles, justice, Nov. 1, 1739.

" Preserved, and Martha Mowry; m. by Wm. Jenckes, justice, Apr. 26, 1744.

" Capt. Enock, of Smithfield, and Alice Brown, of Gloucester; m. by Thomas Owen, justice, Feb. 23, 1751.

" Christopher, and Elizabeth (or Esther) Fairbrother; m. by Thomas Lapham, justice, Apr. 15, 1753.

" Tabitha, and Joseph Gile, Sept. 13, 1756.

" Jabez, and Mercy Arnold; m. by Benjamin Arnold, justice, Oct. 13, 1757.

✓ " James, of Gloucester, and Anne King, resident of Smithfield; m. by Stephen Sly, justice, Nov. 18, 1757.

" Amity, and Henry Jenckes, Oct. 7, 1759.

" Anthony, and Ruth Broadway; m. by Daniel Mowry, Jr., justice, Jan. 1, 1761.

" Mary, and Thomas Lapham, June 25, 1761.

" Uriah, and Amie Tyler; m. by Jabez Harris, justice, July 5, 1761.

" Dinah, and Wanton Mowry, June 25, 1762.

" Capt. Richard, and Sarah Phillips; m. by Rev. John Winsor, Oct. 12, 1762.

" William and Marcy Sprague; m. by Daniel Mowry, Jr., justice, Oct. 16, 1763.

- Harris Urania, and Jonathan Farnum, Sept. 29, 1765.
- " Izreal, of Preserved, and Ruth Mussey, of Thomas ;
m. by Daniel Mowry, Jr., justice, Dec. 9, 1770.
- " Lydia, and Nathaniel Spaulding, Oct. 27, 1774.
- " Elethan, and Oliver Arnold, Dec. 3, 1778.
- " Jesse, of Preserved, and Naomi Jenckes, of Thomas ;
m. by Stephen Brayton, justice, Nov. 1, 1781.
- " David, of Abner, and Rachel Jenckes, of Thomas ; m.
by Stephen Brayton, justice, Sept. 19, 1782.
- " Jonathan, of Abner, and Mary Jenckes, of Thomas ;
m. by Stephen Brayton, justice, Oct. 3, 1785.
- " Jeremiah, of Jeremiah of Smithfield, and Rachel Hath-
away, of Silvanus of Cumberland ; m. by Rev. Abner
Ballou, May 29, 1788.
- " William, of Abner, dec., and Barberry Allen, of Water-
man, dec., of Cumberland ; m. by Rev. Edward Mit-
chell, Dec. 24, 1789.
- " Mary, and Michael Sprague, Feb. 11, 1790.
- " Simeon, of Smithfield, and Keziah Handy, of Uxbridge ;
m. by Rev. William Bowen, May 19, 1791.
- " Mary, and Stephen Angel, Dec. 23, 1792.
- " Mary, and George Hill, Nov. 11, 1793.
- " Welcome, of David, Jun., and Zeria Sayles, of John ;
m. by Benjamin Sheldon, justice, May 26, 1796.
- " Achzah, and Ephraim Mowry, Jan. 8, 1797.
- " Nicholas, of Richard of Smithfield, and Lucy Handy,
of Benjamin of Uxbridge ; m. by Edward Medbury,
justice, Aug. 10, 1797.
- " David F., of Joseph, and Lydia Streeter, of Rufus ; m.
by Thomas Man, justice, Dec. 31, 1800.
- " Jabez, of Stephen, and Waite Wing, of Joshub ; m. by
Thomas Man, justice, May 1, 1803.
- " Betsey, and Silas Smith, May 25, 1806.
- " Farnum, of David, dec., and Olive Mowry, of William ;
m. by Thomas Man, justice, Mar. 12, 1809.
- " Martha, and Thomas Mowry, June 9, 1811.

Harris Keziah, and Benjamin Lindsey, June 7, 1818.

“ David, 2d son of Welcome, and Lavina Mowry, of Abial ; m. by Thomas Man, justice, Mar. 13, 1823.

“ Thomas J., of Nicholas, and — Holley, of William ; m. by Thomas Man, justice, Jan. —, 1830.

“ Mason, of Burrillville, son of Simeon of Uxbridge, and Abigail Scott Aldrich, of George 4th, of Smithfield ; m. by Nathaniel Mowry, justice, July 4, 1833.

“ Eliza J. and Allen Bishop, July 28, 1840.

“ Albert Tillinghast, and Frances Amanda Sherman ; m. by Rev. William S. Balch, Feb. 25, 1841.

“ Joanna, and George Tyler, Feb. 5, 1843.

“ Hezekiah S. and Susan M. Jawger ; m. by Rev. Edwin Leigh, Aug. 27, 1843.

“ Waity Ann, and Richard Mowry, Nov. 30, 1843.

“ Abigail, and Talcott Curtis, Nov. 25, 1845.

“ Mehitable, and Proctor Ames, Mar. 8, 1846.

“ Caroline R. and Sayles C. Newell, May 10, 1846.

“ Ellen, and Alfred Chatterton, Sept. 17, 1849.

“ Ralph, and Elizabeth Thompson, both of Salem, Mass. ; m. by Rev. T. A. Taylor, Aug. 21, 1850.

Hartshorn Sylvester, of Providence, son of Charles, and Amie Waterman, of Smithfield, dau. of Thomas, Dec. 7, 1820.

“ Wellington P. of Lynn, Mass., and Phebe M. Kelton, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. Edwin C. Brown, May 28, 1849.

Hartwell George M., of Fitchburg, Mass., son of Nathan, of Littleton, Mass., and Mary E. Cozzens, of Smithfield ; m. by Rev. Mowry Phillips, July 13, 1848.

Hart Wellington S. and Celistia E. Phillips, both of Mendon, Mass. ; m. by Rev. T. A. Taylor, Aug. 26, 1844.

“ Joseph S. of Milbury, Mass., and Harriet Bourne ; m. by Rev. Emory W. Porter, Mar. 20, 1845.

Haskin Nicholas, of Tiverton, R. I., and Lydia Sly, of Gloucester ; m. by Thomas Sayles, justice, Apr. 30, 1744.

Hastings Mary Elizabeth, and Jeremiah Niles, May 17, 1842.

Hatch Harriet Celinda, and Joseph Colwell Allen, Jan. 12, 1841.

Hathaway Rachel, and Jeremiah Harris, May 29, 1788.

" Mrs. Abigail, dau. of Dr. Peleg, and Simon Horton, June 30, 1811.

" Joseph R. of Smithfield, and Phebe Ann Caroline Wilcox, of Providence; m. by Rev. Reuben Allen, June 17, 1839.

Hautless Adam, and Mary Gaskill; m. by William Arnold, justice, Dec. 28, 1741.

Hawkins Sarah, and Richard Sweet, June 19, 1733.

" Abigail, and Richard Sayles, Jr., Sept. 2, 1742.

" Zephanah, and Mary Marvel; m. by Thomas Steere, justice, Nov. 26, 1752.

" Lydia, and James Young, Nov. 19, 1755.

" Sarah, and William Pain, Nov. 23, 1757.

" Charles, and Sarah Olney; m. by Samuel Winsor, justice, Sept. 4, 1760.

" Mary, and Abraham Angel, Dec. 13, 1761.

" Jeremiah, and Ruth Mowry, dau. of Joseph; m. by Daniel Mowry, Jr., justice, Aug. 13, 1772.

" Mary, and Asa Sheldon, May 6, 1804.

" Harris, of John, of Smithfield, and Mrs. Mehitable Angel, of William, of Johnston, R. I.; m. by Samuel Man, justice, Nov. 19, 1809.

" Clarissa D. and Ephraim M. Staples, Jan. 30, 1840.

" Elnora, and Arnold H. Whipple, May 26, 1841.

" Smith B., of Charles, and Susannah Y. Tyler, of Providence, dau. of Abner; m. by Obed Pain, justice, June 29, 1843.

Hawks Lucretia, and Charles Brown, Feb. 8, 1795.

Haws Anne, and Obediah Herendeen, June 11, 1750.

Hayden Susan, and Jenckes R. Kelton, Dec. 23, 1838.

(*To be continued.*)

THE FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS AND RHODE ISLAND CLAIMANTS.

*A paper read before the Rhode Island Historical Society,
December 1, 1885, by Amasa M. Eaton, Esq.,
of Providence.*

THIS subject is but a memory of the past to those of the present generation. But the passage by Congress of the act for the relief of the descendants of claimants has awakened general interest in the subject, and it will prove interesting and instructive to examine its history.

In December, 1776, the United States, recognizing the benefit of an alliance with France, offered to the French Government a subsidy of two millions of dollars worth of provisions and six frigates, our assistance in the recovery of certain islands and rights then in the possession of England, and any other assistance which might be in our power, as good allies, if France would help us by an offensive alliance against Great Britain (*Secret Journal of Congress, vol. ii., pp. 30, 38, 39, 40.*) Then came the darkest hour of our struggle with Great Britain,—when, in the midst of gloom and suffering, our soldiers at Valley Forge, hungry, barefoot and in rags, Washington wrote to Congress that, “unless some great and capital change takes place the army must be inevitably reduced to one or the other of three things—starve, dissolve or disperse.”

The great and capital change did come, and to the great rejoicing of this country the news was received during the darkest hours of our struggle with England that a treaty of alliance had been signed by Franklin and the other plenipotentiaries on the 6th of February, 1778, between France and the United States (*Statutes at Large, vol. viii., p. 6.*) On

the same day another treaty, called the treaty of amity and commerce, was also entered into between the same States (*Statutes at Large*, vol. viii., p. 13.)

By Article 11 of the first named treaty the contracting parties guaranteed "mutually from the present time and forever against all other powers, to wit, the United States to His Most Christian Majesty, the present possession of the crown of France in America, as well as those which it may acquire by the future treaty of peace. And His Most Christian Majesty guarantees on his part, to the United States, their liberty, sovereignty and independence, absolute and unlimited, as well in matters of commerce, and also their possessions and the additions or conquests that their confederation may obtain during the war from any of the dominions now or heretofore possessed by Great Britain in North America," &c.

Article 12 provided this reciprocal guaranty should take effect the moment war should break out between France and England, and by Article 17 of the second treaty each country agreed to open its ports to the ships of war and privateers of the other, and to close them to those of the enemy of either, except when driven in by stress of weather.

And by the Consular Convention, so called, of November 14, 1788, between the United States and France, it was agreed that the consuls of each nation should have jurisdiction in the ports of the other in all civil cases relating to the vessels and crews of their own nation.

But after the successful issue of our Revolution, it was felt in the United States that we had promised too much. Public sentiment, which gradually took shape in the Munroe doctrine, now an accepted principle of every political party, gradually but definitely recognized the fact that we should not entangle ourselves in the affairs of Europe nor allow any foreign power to restrict our dealings with other nations. Hence, when difficulties arose between France and England, and France turned to us for that help which she felt she had a right to expect, great was her disappointment to find our statesmen

inclined to neutrality and a withdrawal from our treaty obligations with her.

Under the leadership of Jefferson, who hated the English, and the tendency of the Federalists, headed by Hamilton, to further assimilation of English principles, the Democratic party was inclined towards the support of the French. But such a course was bitterly resented by many, including the Federalists generally, and party feeling ran high. The French Revolution burst forth in all its fury and war ensued in 1793 between France and England. The most bitter difference of opinion arose in this country and in the Cabinet between the sections briefly described, as to the course to be pursued by the United States, some holding that the obligations of the treaty guaranties ceased with the cessation of the French monarchy, others holding that they were perpetual, whatever the form of government of France. The famous proclamation of neutrality of the United States was issued April 22d, 1793. (*Senate Doc. No. 102, 1826, p. 249.*)

Chief Justice Marshall, with the very best opportunities for correct knowledge, says that the proclamation was intended to prevent the French Minister from demanding the performance of the guarantee contained in the treaty of alliance. The French Minister reported to the French Government "that the Secretary of War, on my communicating the wish of the Windward Islands to receive promptly some firearms and some cannon, which might put into a state of defence, possessions guaranteed by the United States, had the front to answer, with an ironical carelessness, that the principles established by the President did not permit him to lend so much as a pistol."

The effect of the proclamation and of the resulting course pursued by this country was to annul the treaty, although all intention to annul it was denied at the time. Looked at from the point of view of the best political policy for this country to follow, this proclamation of neutrality takes high rank. Politically we were wise, but morally we were wrong. It

would have been more honest to ask for the abrogation of the treaty. But the public and Congress were divided and distracted in opinion. Party feeling ran high, and bitterness and animosity reigned to an extent of which we can form no idea now except from critical study of the history and spirit of that time. We are told that a man would cross the street to avoid recognition of an acquaintance who was of the opposite side in politics, and men would not make their daily purchases except of shopkeepers of their own party!

None foresaw the results that followed, the estrangement between us and France, the mutual wrongdoing, until at last we stood upon the brink of war with that power without whose aid we might not have achieved our independence. None foresaw that the course entered upon was virtually an attempt to abrogate the treaties in the worst way a treaty can be abrogated, *i. e.*, by its repudiation by one of the contracting parties without the assent of the other party.

But blameworthy as was our conduct that of France was equally so. Only seventeen days after our proclamation of neutrality, and therefore before knowledge of it had reached France, the National Convention of France, on the 9th of May, 1793, issued a decree authorizing French ships of war and privateers to arrest and bring into the ports of the republic all neutral vessels laden either wholly or in part with neutral articles of provisions belonging to neutral nations and destined for an enemy's port, or with merchandise belonging to an enemy. This decree was issued in retaliation for the English attempt to starve the French by general blockade and seizure of neutral vessels with provisions on their way to France. So rigorously were these measures enforced by England that the English market was glutted with provision, while in France flour sold at forty dollars a barrel. It was admitted, in this decree itself, that it was a violation of the rights of neutrals, but the necessity of the case was urged as an excuse, and indemnity was promised to neutrals who might suffer by its operation. As the decree was a

direct violation of the 23d article of our treaty of commerce, Mr. Morris, then resident minister of the United States at Paris, remonstrated and claimed exemption for American vessels from its operation, according to the terms of the treaty.

On the 23d of May, 1793, the National Convention formally declared that vessels of the United States were not to be included in the operation of this decree. Such was the instability of the French, however, that this decree of May 23d was abrogated by decree May 28th, and after various contradictory decrees, American commerce was left exposed to destruction under the first decree, that of May 9th. What with the consequent illegal acts of French privateers and the retaliatory acts of the British Government, many of our vessels were captured amidst excesses of all kinds, and a vast amount of American property was destroyed.

When information of these acts of spoliation reached the United States, the result was disastrous to confidence in maritime business. Merchants hesitated to expose their ships and cargoes to such risks. To restore confidence, our Government came forward with voluntary assurances of protection and redress, and Jefferson, then Secretary of State, issued a circular letter dated August 27th, 1793, in which he said :

“ Complaint having been made to the Government of some instances of unjustifiable vexation and spoliation committed on our merchant vessels by the privateers of the powers at war, and it being possible that other instances may have happened, of which no information has been given to the Government, I have it in charge from the President to assure the merchants of the United States concerned in foreign commerce that due attention will be paid to any injuries on the high seas or in foreign countries, contrary to the law of nations, or to existing treaties ; and that, on their forwarding hither, to the Department of State, well authenticated evidence of the same, proper proceedings will be adopted for their relief.” (*Senate Document 102, 1826, p. 216.*)

President Washington, in his message of December 5th, 1793, also referred to these acts of spoliation, as follows :

"The vexations and spoliations understood to have been committed on our vessels and commerce by the cruisers and officers of some of the belligerent powers, appeared to require attention. The proofs of these, however, not having been brought forward, the description of citizens supposed to have suffered were notified that on furnishing them to the Executive, due measures would be taken to obtain redress of the past and more effectual provisions against the future." (*Senate Doc. 102, 1826, p. 253.*)

In commenting on these official declarations, Charles Sumner says:

"Here, then, was a double promise from the national government, under the influence of which our merchants continued their commerce and ventured once more upon the ocean. Their Government had tempted them, and on the occurrence of 'injuries on the high seas' these good citizens, according to instructions, made haste to lodge with the Department of State the 'well authenticated evidences of the same.' Their grandchildren and great-grandchildren are waiting, even now, the promised redress. (*Senate Report 10, 41st Congress, 2d session, 1870.*)

In response, our merchants lodged with the State Department their evidences of losses. The Department forwarded these papers to France, and strange as it may seem, kept no copies or records of them. They cannot be found now in Paris, and this accounts for part of the difficulty now met with in getting proof of these losses.

The French Minister to the United States, Fauchet, under date of March 27th, 1794, wrote to our Secretary of State:

"If any of your merchants have suffered any injury by the conduct of our privateers (a thing which would be contrary to the intention and express order of the republic) they may, with confidence, address themselves to the French Government, which will never refuse justice to those whose claims are legal." (*Senate Doc. 102, 1826, p. 263.*)

Mr. Morris, our Minister at Paris, wrote, March 6th, 1794:

"These captures create great confusion, must produce much damage to mercantile men, and are a source of endless and

well-founded complaint. Every post brings me piles of letters about it from all quarters, and I see no remedy. * * * *
In the meantime, if I would give way to the clamors of the injured parties, I ought to make demands very like a declaration of war." (*Senate Doc. No. 102, 1826, p. 77.*)

July 5th, 1794, the French Commissioner of Foreign Relations wrote to Mr. Morris:

"The sentiments of the Convention and of the Government towards your fellow-citizens are too well known to you to leave a doubt of their disposition to make good the losses which circumstances inseparable from a great revolution may have caused some American navigators to experience. (*Senate Doc. No. 102, 1826, p. 77.*)

We cannot stop to examine the history of the negotiations which led to the adoption of the treaty with Great Britain known as Jay's Treaty, dated November 19th, 1794. It was long held under advisement by our Senate, and was finally ratified in February, 1796. Historians relate at length the animosities aroused, already referred to, and the division in public opinion and sentiment of the time. The treaty was the culmination of the policy which amounted to the abrogation of our treaty obligations with France. The two treaties could not stand side by side. One or the other must be inoperative because they were contradictory. The treaty with England gave the same exclusive rights to her ships of war and privateers to shelter, etc., in our ports, and to sell their prizes, etc., that we had already given, also exclusively, to France. One of the articles of the treaty with England provided that prizes made by either England or the United States should be free to enter the ports of the other, and that no shelter or refuge should be given in the ports of either to such as should have made a prize upon the subjects or citizens of either. This was in direct contravention of our treaty with France.

Other objectionable articles in the British treaty were the surrender of the principle that "free ships make free goods" and the allowing English cruisers to capture goods or subjects of their enemies from our vessels, thus rendering French prop-

erty and Frenchmen on board our ships liable to seizure, while the property and persons of the enemies of France, similarly situated, were protected by the 23d article of our treaty with France of 1778. Here we find the germ of the English doctrine afterwards asserted of "the right of search," one of the causes of our next war with her.

The list of contraband articles was also much extended in the Jay treaty as compared with the list in the French treaty. This was particularly injurious to France, then fighting against Europe generally, by increasing the difficulty of procuring articles of which she was then in great need. It helped to render more effective the English plan of starving the French into submission, by making more complete the English control of the high seas. Our Government immediately prohibited French privateers from fitting out vessels or from selling their prizes in our ports.

Upon deliberate examination of all these facts, the conclusion is inevitable that the course pursued by the United States was indefensible. The opportunity was given to us to negotiate a new treaty with France, but we declined it, and then deliberately violated the old treaty, and persistently maintained that course. The French Minister wrote, November 14th, 1793, to our Secretary of State :

"I beg you to lay open to the President the decree and the enclosed note, and to obtain from him the earliest decision, either the guarantee I have claimed the fulfilment of for our colonies, or upon the mode of negotiation of the new treaty I was charged to propose to the United States, which would make of the two nations but one family." (*American State Papers, 1 Foreign Affairs, p. 199.*)

The guarantee here referred to was the perpetual guarantee to the French of their possessions in America, before explained. At the time of the execution of the treaty these possessions were the islands of St. Domingo, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Ste. Lucie, St. Vincent, Tobago, Deseada, Mariegalante, St. Pierre, Miquelon, Granada, and, on the mainland, Cayenne. The oc-

casation for the enforcement of this guarantee had already become urgent, for many of these islands were lost to the French in 1793, and, Alison says in his History, vol. iii., p. 396, "with hardly any loss to the victorious nation."

The news of the Jay treaty with England moved the whole French nation to indignation, as well it might. In conversation with Mr. Munroe, then our Minister to France, the French Minister said "that France had much cause of complaint against us independently of our treaty with England, but that, by this treaty, ours with them was annihilated." (*American State Papers, 1 Foreign Affairs, p. 731.*)

M. Adet, the French plenipotentiary to the United States, addressed our Government as follows :

"The undersigned, minister plenipotentiary of the French Republic, now fulfills to the Secretary of State of the United States a painful but sacred duty. He claims, in the name of American honor, in the name of the faith of treaties, the execution of that contract which assured to the United States their existence, and which France regarded as the pledge of the most sacred union between two people, the freest upon earth." (*American State Papers, 1 Foreign Affairs, p. 579.*)

In retaliation for our conduct the French Government passed three decrees. The first was to the effect that all neutrals would be treated in the same way as they might allow the English to treat the French. Under the second, the stipulations of the treaty of 1778 concerning the neutrality of the flags were suspended, and were altered in most essential points; and under the third decree the list of contraband of war was enlarged, Americans in the service of England were declared to be pirates, and certain documents were declared to be necessary to determine the national character of American ships. Among these documents a *rôle d'équipage* (a list of the crew in a particular form) was declared essential, although the 25th article of the treaty of 1778 specifically prescribed the form of sea letter to be used by the vessels of the two countries.

On the 30th of April, 1797, the French Minister of Marine was requested to declare officially whether American vessels not having a *rôle d'équipage* were good prize and whether the cargoes of such ships were also lawful prize. He decided that every American vessel without such a *rôle* was an enemy, and that therefore both vessel and cargo were subject to confiscation. The number of captures of American vessels now increased rapidly, and all remonstrances were in vain. The French, while admitting these decrees to be in conflict with the treaty, persisted in carrying them into effect. No matter what trade American vessels were engaged in, or with whom they were trading, they were seized and confiscated, against all law, under the color of law. Reprehensible as our conduct had been, that of the French was now equally so. In the remaining French islands in the West Indies the same spirit was manifested, and the plunder derived from this source formed the principal part of their revenue. In a report to the French Directory from their government it was stated: "That having found no resource in finance, and knowing the unfriendly disposition of the Americans, and to avoid perishing in distress, they had armed for cruising, and that already eighty-seven cruisers were at sea; and that for three months preceding, the administration had subsisted, and individuals been enriched, by the product of their prizes. They felicitated themselves that American vessels were daily taken, and declared they had learned, by divers persons from the continent, that the Americans were corrupt, perfidious, the friends of England, and that their vessels no longer entered the French ports unless carried in by force."

I have made thorough examination of all the registers, manifests and protests in the Custom Houses in Providence and Newport, and these records, of which I have minutes, show that a large proportion of the losses incurred in this State were incurred at this period in this way, our vessels having been captured and taken into the French ports in the West India islands and there condemned and sold. During

the last summer all these records have been forwarded to the Department of State in Washington, in response to directions received from the Government, to be used as evidence, either by claimants or the Government, in the trial of petitions for indemnity before the Court of Claims, under the terms of the Act of Congress of last winter, which I will explain later.

Lest the statements made of the conduct of the French may be thought to be exaggerated, I will quote an extract from a report made by our Secretary of State to the President, in reply to a resolution of the House of Representatives, on the 21st of June, 1797. After mentioning the French decrees, the report says :

“ Besides these several decrees, and others, which, being more limited, the former have superseded, the old marine ordinances of France have been revived and enforced with severity both in Europe and the West Indies. The want of or informality in a bill of lading, the want of a certified list of the passengers and crew, the supercargo being by birth a foreigner, although a naturalized citizen of the United States, the destruction of a paper of any kind soever, and the want of a sea letter, have been deemed sufficient to warrant a condemnation of American vessels and property, although the proofs of the property were indubitable. The West Indies, as before remarked, have exhibited the most lamentable scene of depredation. Indeed, the conduct of the public agents and of the commissioned cruisers there has surpassed all former examples. The American vessels have not only been captured under the decrees before mentioned, but when brought to trial in the French tribunals the vessels and cargoes have been condemned without admitting the owners or their agents to make any defence. This seems to be done systematically and for the obvious purpose of ensuring condemnations. By this monstrous abuse in judicial proceedings, frauds and falsehoods, as well as flimsy and shameless pretexts, pass unexamined and uncontradicted, and are made the foundation of sentences of condemnation.”

The differences between the two countries had now assumed definite form, and we were on the verge of war. The French Government had valid claims against our Government for in-

fraction of treaty obligations, and our citizens held valid claims against the French Government for acts of spoliation committed by her privateers upon our commerce. How were the two countries to extricate themselves from the dilemma?

In June, 1797, Messrs. Pinckney, Marshall and Gerry were appointed by the President of the United States Envoys Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary "to negotiate with the French Government on all subjects of difference between the two nations, and to make a treaty or convention for determining the same."

The Secretary of State, Mr. Pickering, in his letter of instructions to these envoys, dated July 15, 1797, said :

"Although the reparation for losses sustained by the citizens of the United States, in consequence of irregular or illegal captures or condemnations, or forcible seizures or detentions, is of very high importance, and is to be pressed with the greatest earnestness, yet it is not to be insisted on as an indispensable condition of the proposed treaty. You are not, however, to renounce these claims of our citizens, nor to stipulate that they be assumed by the United States as a loan to the French Government."

The envoys were also instructed to buy a release of our guarantee of the French islands, and they were authorized to offer to France a war subsidy in money or in provisions to the amount of two hundred thousand dollars annually.

But their mission was in vain. They were first indirectly asked to pay a bribe, under the pleasanter name of a *gratification*, of twelve hundred thousand francs! which, of course, they refused to pay. They were not allowed to hold official intercourse with the French Government. They remained some time in Paris on sufferance, and held informal interviews with Talleyrand and others, but could accomplish nothing, so they returned to America. Washington was called upon to be in readiness, for war with France was impending and was almost daily expected.

An Act of Congress of May 28th, 1798, authorized our navy to capture "armed vessels of the Republic of France which

have committed or shall be found hovering on the coast of the United States for the purpose of committing depredations on vessels belonging to citizens thereof." An Act of June 13th, 1798, suspended all commercial intercourse between the United States and France "until the Government of France shall clearly disavow and shall be found to refrain from the aggressions, depredations and hostilities by them encouraged and maintained against the vessels and other property of the United States."

The next Act of Congress of June 25th, 1798, authorized merchant vessels of the United States to resist search or seizure by any armed French vessel, to repel assaults and to capture the aggressors until "the Government of France shall cause the commanders and crews of all armed French vessels to refrain from the lawless depredations and outrages hitherto encouraged and authorized by that Government against the merchant vessels of the United States."

Finally, by Act of Congress of July 7th, 1798, the treaties with France were declared to be annulled and no longer obligatory, the preamble stating "that the just claims of the United States for reparation of injuries had been refused, and their attempts to negotiate an amicable adjustment of all complaints between the two nations had been repelled with indignity." The treaties with France were thus declared to be annulled on the ground that France had violated them. It is true the treaty of amity and commerce had been violated by France. But it had never been alleged that France had violated the treaty of alliance; on the contrary, France had strictly and honorably fulfilled all her obligations under it. She helped us to win our independence at a cost estimated at two hundred and eighty millions of dollars in money and untold loss of priceless human lives. The only violation of the treaty of alliance was on the part of the United States in issuing the declaration of neutrality and in nullifying the treaty by the Act of Congress of July 7th, 1798, so far as such acts could effect its nullification. France, very naturally

and very properly, denied the right or the power of either party to annul a treaty without the consent of the other party to the treaty. It is clear that where there are two treaties, as in this case, the violation of one of them does not affect the other; the treaty of alliance should have been held as still in force, even if the treaty of amity and commerce was legally annulled by the Act of Congress of July 7th, 1798. (*See Vattel, p. 275.*)

John Adams became President, and in 1799, desirous of a peaceful settlement with France, and upon her invitation, he appointed a new commission consisting of Chief Justice Ellsworth, Davie and Murray as Envoys to France. Their instructions were to secure indemnity for spoliation on our commerce, the cessation of the seizure of American vessels for want of the technical *rôle d'équipage*, the termination of our guarantee of the French West India islands, the abrogation of all the treaties between France and the United States, and the formation of a new treaty in which all obligations should be specified. From these instructions it is apparent that while our Government meant to do away with the burden of the national guarantee, it also meant to secure indemnity for the just claims of our citizens.

We have not time now to follow the negotiations that took place in Paris. Propositions and counter-propositions were made and rejected by both parties. It is enough for our purpose to know that France at last offered two propositions, one being the acknowledgment of the continuance of the old treaties by the United States, in which case France offered full indemnity for her illegal spoliations on our commerce, the other proposition being that a new treaty should be entered into, doing away with the perpetual guarantee to the French of their possessions in America and with the other provisions of the old treaties, France to be placed on an equality with the most favored nation by the United States, in which case no indemnity for spoliation would be made by France. This proposition, as stated by Webster in his speech on French

Spoliations in the Senate, January 12th, 1835, was, to quote his words:

"If you will acknowledge or renew the obligation of the old treaties, which secure to us privileges in your ports which our enemies are not to enjoy, then we will make indemnities for the losses of your citizens; or, if you will give up all claim for such indemnities, then we will relinquish our special privileges under the former treaties and agree to a new treaty which shall only put us on a footing of equality with Great Britain, our enemy." (*4 Webster's Works, p. 173.*)

Our envoys did not feel that they were authorized to accept either proposition. They wrote home August 15th, 1800, that it had now become manifest that negotiations must be abandoned or their instructions must be deviated from. Further negotiation ensued. At last our envoys determined it would be best to make some temporary arrangement which would extricate the United States from the situation in which they were involved, save the immense property of American citizens then awaiting adjudication before the French Council of Prizes, and secure, as far as possible, American commerce against the abuses of capture during the war then existing between France and England. Sept. 4th, 1800, the French Government proposed that the indemnities due by France to the citizens of the United States should be paid by the United States, France, in return, to yield the exclusive privileges secured to her under the 17th and 22d articles of the treaty of commerce and the rights under the guarantee of the 11th article of the treaty of alliance. Here was a distinct proposition of set off. The United States were to assume and pay the just claims of American citizens against France, and France was to relinquish her claims against the United States arising under the treaties, and also the guarantee and the exclusive rights thereunder. Our envoys declared these propositions to be inadmissible. The conferences continued through the month, and on September 30th, 1800, a "provisional treaty" was agreed upon. At the request of the

French, this title, which too plainly showed its temporary character, was subsequently changed to that of "convention," which name it still bears on our statute book.

Article 2 is as follows:

"The ministers plenipotentiary of the two parties, not being able to agree at present, respecting the treaty of alliance of 6th February, 1778, the treaty of amity and commerce of the same date and the convention of the 14th of November, 1778, nor upon the indemnities mutually due or claimed, the parties will negotiate further on these subjects at a convenient time; and until they may have agreed upon these points, the said treaties and convention shall have no operation, and the relations of the two countries shall be as follows:"

The next two articles provided for the mutual restoration of vessels and property captured, but not yet condemned: the fifth and last article provided that "the debts contracted by one of the two nations with individuals of the other, or by the individuals of the one with the individuals of the other, shall be paid, or the payment may be prosecuted in the same manner as if there had been no misunderstanding between the two States. But this clause shall not extend to indemnities claimed on account of captures or confiscations."

This convention was signed at Morfortaine, the country seat of Joseph Bonaparte, and the occasion was made a festival, which has been celebrated by the engraving of Piranesi. The First Consul, Lafayette and other notables were guests there, and Napoleon proposed as a toast, "The manes of the French and the Americans who died on the field of battle for the independence of the new world."

This convention, after it was signed by the ministers of the two countries, was sent to the United States, and submitted by the President to the Senate; and the Senate, on the 3d of February, 1801, consented to and advised its ratification, provided the second article be expunged and the following inserted: "It is agreed that the present convention shall be in force for the term of eight years from the time of the ex-

change of the ratifications," which change received the approval of the President, February 8th, 1801, by his proclamation announcing the ratification, "saving and excepting the second article, which is declared to be expunged, and of no force or validity." (*Statutes at Large*, vol. viii., p. 192.)

Mr. Murray, our Minister in Paris, wrote home his fear that the French Government would still press for an article of formal abandonment of our claims for spoliation, which he wrote he should evade. The French feared that the unconditional suppression of the second article would leave them still exposed to the claims of the United States without any chance to advance their counter-claims. They did not object to a mutual abandonment of claims, which, in the language of Mr. Murray, "would always be a set-off against each other."

At last, on the 31st of July, 1801, the convention was ratified by Napoleon, then First Consul, with the addition made by our Senate limiting it to eight years, and with the retrenchment of the second article by our Senate—the whole with the proviso added by the First Consul "that by this retrenchment the two States renounce the respective pretensions, which are the object of the said article."

It was again returned to the United States, and Jefferson, who meanwhile had succeeded Adams as President, again submitted it to the Senate, which, on the 19th of December, 1801, resolved "that the Senate consider the said convention as fully ratified, and return it to the President for promulgation." It was accordingly promulgated by the President, December 21st, 1801, and thus became the supreme law of the land in France and in the United States. Both countries were well out of a most troublesome and dangerous difficulty.

The net result was that the United States assumed the claims of its citizens against France by thus using them in offset in settlement of the claims of France against her, and, in return, France released her treaty obligations, past, present and future, against the United States. The United States thus became absolved from that troublesome guarantee of the

French islands, from the grant of the exclusive privileges made to the French, and from all claims for damages arising from non-fulfilment of these obligations. Such was the opinion of the statesmen conducting the negotiations, and of most of the leading statesmen of that period and their successors to the present time. (See, for instance, the letter from the Hon. W. C. Preston, of January 29th, 1844, Appendix No. 3 to the speech of the Hon. John M. Clayton delivered in the Senate, April 23d and 24th, 1846; and the letter from the Hon. Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State under Washington, dated May 19th, 1824, Appendix No. 2 to the same speech.) The Emperor Napoleon at Saint Helena, dictating the events of his reign, said: "The suppression of this article" (the second article of the convention of 1800) "at once put an end to the privileges which France had possessed by the treaty of 1778, and annulled the just claims which America might have made for injuries done in time of peace." (*Gourgaud's Memoirs of the History of France*, vol. ii., p. 129.)

The case was clearly stated by Henry Clay, while Secretary of State, in the message of the President to the Senate on French Spoliations (*Senate Document No. 102, 1826, p. 7*):

"The two contracting parties thus agreed by the retrenchment of the second article mutually to renounce the respective pretensions which were the object of that article. The pretensions of the United States, to which allusion is thus made, arose out of the spoliations, under the color of French authority, in contravention to law and existing treaties. Those of France sprung from the treaty of alliance of the 6th of February, 1778, the treaty of amity and commerce, and the convention of the 14th of November, 1788. Whatever obligations or indemnities from these sources either party had a right to demand, were respectively waived and abandoned; and the consideration which induced one party to renounce his pretensions was that of the renunciation by the other party of his pretensions. What was the value of the obligations and indemnities so reciprocally renounced can only be matter of speculation. The amount of the indemnities due to citizens of the United States was very large; and on the other

hand the obligation was great (to specify no other French pretensions) under which the United States were placed, in the 11th article of the treaty of alliance of 6th of February, 1778, by which they were bound forever to guarantee from that time their possessions to the crown of France in America, as well as those which it might acquire by the future treaty of peace with Great Britain: all these possessions having been, it is believed, conquered at, or not long after, the exchange of the ratifications of the convention of September, 1800, by the arms of Great Britain, from France."

Mr. Madison, then Secretary of State, in an official communication to our Minister, Mr. Pinckney, wrote :

"The claims from which France were released were admitted by France, and the release was for a valuable consideration, in a correspondent release of the United States from certain claims on them."

Mr. Pickering wrote, November 19th, 1824 :

"Then it seems clear that as our government applied the merchants' property to buy off those old treaties, the sums so applied should be reimbursed."

And Chief Justice Marshall, himself at one time one of the plenipotentiaries, as we have seen, and with the very best of opportunities for judging of this matter, said he was satisfied from his own knowledge our government was under the strongest obligation to compensate the sufferers by the French spoliations.

All through this century resolutions and reports of committees of many of the State Legislatures have recommended to Congress the payment of these claims. Memorials innumerable have been presented to Congress from claimants and their heirs. These claims have been acknowledged to be just claims against the United States by our statesmen all through the century, including Webster, Clay, Sumner and others illustrious in the annals of Congress and the history of our country. These memorials and petitions for redress have been referred to forty-two committees of Congress since 1800.

The first two committees (in 1802 and 1807) made no report. The next (in 1818, 1822 and 1824) reported adversely. But every report made since then, thirty-seven in number, has recommended the allowance of these claims. The first five reports were not favorable, because so little was then known about the matter, even to the committee or claimants themselves. In 1826 the President, in compliance with a resolution of the Senate, sent in a message to the Senate with copies of all the instructions to our ministers and envoys to France, and of all the correspondence and negotiations on the subject, making a thick volume of 840 pages. This is the Senate Document No. 102, 1826, to which I have often referred. Then for the first time did the country and the claimants themselves know the full strength and justice of these claims, and since then every committee of Congress to which this matter has been referred has reported favorably upon these claims and recommended measures for their adjudication and allowance; that is to say, since 1826, when this Senate Document No. 102 was published, committees of Congress have reported in favor of these claimants thirty-seven times and still their just claims remain unpaid. It would be difficult to find any parallel instance in history of such glaring and perverse injustice.

Several causes combined have prevented the acknowledgment and payment by Congress of these claims. As explained above, it was not until 1826 that they were really understood. The South, then in power, was jealous of the North, and of these claims; and Congress was always appalled by their magnitude. We must remember that before 1861 very different ideas obtained over what obtain now, as to our wealth and resources and ability to pay national claims, immense in amount.

Before the establishment of the Court of Claims there was no adequate tribunal to refer such claims to, for adjudication as to their merits and validity. A committee of Congress, sitting during the recess, as was sometimes proposed, was

entirely incompetent for such work. And so these claims have dragged along, and we have all seen piteous accounts in the newspapers of the death in some almshouse or town poor-farm of the descendant of some merchant brought to ruin early in the century by acts of French spoliation, some poor creature whose life for fifty years was spent hoping for that justice from our Government he had a right to expect, but which never came.

In 1846 the bill recommended by the committee for the relief of these claimants passed both houses of Congress, but was vetoed by President Polk. In 1855 the bill recommended by the committee again passed both houses, but was vetoed by President Pierce. In brief, Polk argued that it was too late in the season and he had but little time to examine the matter; that the amount involved was large, while the country was in debt, that the claims were stale, that it was not proposed to pay them in full, &c., &c.

Pierce argued that the passage of such a measure would inculcate those who for fifty years had failed to pass the measure; that as the treaties were abrogated by one party, neither party had claims to release under them—as if one party can legally rescind a contract, or if it could, that it could annul all claims arising prior to such rescission—with other objections which we cannot stop to examine, but all of which were frivolous and wide of the mark.

The following is a list of the reports of committees of Congress upon these claims (from *Report No. 109, House of Representatives, 48th Congress, 1st session,*):

Number.	Where reported.	By whom reported.	Committee.	Date.	Bills and reports.	Detailed Reports.
1	House..	Mr. Giles (¹).	Select.	April 22, 1802.	R.
2	House..	Mr. Marion (²).	Select.	February 18, 1807.	R.
3	Senate.	Mr. Roberts.	Claims.	March 3, 1818.	Adverse, No. 124.	R.
4	House..	Mr. Russell.	Foreign Affairs.	January 31, 1822.	Adverse, No. 32.	R.
5	House..	Mr. Forsyth.	Foreign Affairs.	March 23, 1824.	Adverse, No. 94.	R.
6	Senate.	Mr. Holmes.	Select.	February 8, 1827.	Favorable, No. 48.	R.
7	House..	Mr. E. Everett.	Foreign Affairs.	May 21, 1828.	Favorable, No. 262.	R.
8	Senate.	Mr. Chambers.	Select.	May 24, 1828.	Favorable, bill 206.	R.
9	Senate.	Mr. Chambers.	Select.	February 11, 1829.	Favorable, bill 76.	R.
10	Senate.	Mr. E. Everett.	Foreign Affairs.	February 16, 1829.	Favorable, bill 82.	R.
11	Senate.	Mr. E. Livingston.	Select.	February 22, 1830.	Favorable, bill 103.	R.
12	Senate.	Mr. E. Livingston.	Select.	December 21, 1830.	Favorable, bill 31.	R.
13	Senate.	Mr. E. Livingston.	Select.	January 14, 1831.	Favorable, bill 32.	R.
14	Senate.	Mr. Webster (³).	Select.	December 10, 1834.	Favorable, bill 5.
15	Senate.	Mr. Wilkins.	Select.	December 20, 1831.	Favorable, bill 9.
16	House..	Mr. E. Everett.	Foreign Affairs.	February 21, 1835.	Favorable.	R.
17	House..	Mr. Cambreling.	Foreign Affairs.	Minority adverse statement..	{ 121
18	House..	Mr. Howard.	Foreign Affairs.	January 29, 1838.	Favorable, bill 452.
19	House..	Mr. Cushing (⁴).	Foreign Affairs.	March 31, 1838.	Favorable statement.
20	House..	Mr. Pickens.	Foreign Affairs.	April 4, 1840.	Favorable.
21	House..	Mr. Cushing.	Foreign Affairs.	Minority adverse statement..	{ 319
22	Senate.	Mr. Choate.	Foreign Relations.	December 9, 1841.	Favorable, bill 57.	R.
23	Senate.	Mr. Archer.	Foreign Relations.	January 28, 1842.	Favorable, bill 148.
24	House..	Mr. C. J. Ingersoll.	Foreign Affairs.	January 5, 1843.	Favorable, bill 64.
25	House..	Mr. C. J. Ingersoll.	Foreign Affairs.	April 17, 1844.	Favorable, bill 380.

(¹) Favorable statement of facts, without coming to any conclusion.

(²) Favorable, including and adopting Mr. Giles' report of April 22, 1802.

(³) This bill was voted by the Senate, February 3, 1833; yeas 25, nays 20.

(⁴) Individual, by consent of the House.

Number.	Where reported.	By whom reported.	Committee.	Date.	Bills and reports.	Detailed reports.
24	Senate.	Mr. Choate	Foreign Relations..	May 29, 1844.	Favorable, bill 180.	
25	Senate.	Mr. Choate (°)	Foreign Relations..	December 23, 1844.	Favorable, bill 47.	
26	Senate.	Mr. Clayton (°)	Select	February 2, 1846.	Favorable, bill 68.	
27	House.	Mr. Tru. Smith (°)	Foreign Affairs	July 16, 1846.	Favorable, bill 68.	
28	Senate.	Mr. Morehead	Select	February 10, 1847.	Favorable, bill 156.	R.
29	House.	Mr. Tru. Smith	Foreign Affairs	January 4, 1848.	Favorable, bill 21.	
30	Senate.	Mr. Tru. Smith	Select	February 5, 1850.	Favorable, bill 101.	R.
31	House.	Mr. Buel	Foreign Affairs	June 14, 1850.	Favorable, bill 318.	
32	Senate.	Mr. Tru. Smith (°)	Select	January 24, 1851.	Favorable, bill 101.	
33	Senate.	Mr. Bradbury	Select	January 14, 1852.	Favorable, bill 64.	R.
34	Senate.	Mr. Hamlin	Select	February 15, 1854.	Favorable, bill 36.	
35	House.	Mr. Bayly (°)	Foreign Affairs	January 4, 1855.	Favorable, bill 117.	
36	House.	Mr. Pennington	Foreign Affairs	March 3, 1857.	Favorable, bill 863.	
37	Senate.	Mr. Crittenden (°)	Select	February 4, 1858.	Favorable, bill 45.	R.
38	House.	Mr. Clingman	Foreign Affairs	May 6, 1858.	Favorable, bill 532.	
39	House.	Mr. Royce	Foreign Affairs	March 29, 1860.	Favorable, bill 259.	R.
40	Senate.	Mr. Crittenden	Select	June 11, 1860.	Favorable, bill 428.	
41	Senate.	Mr. Sumner	Foreign Relations..	January 13, 1862.	Favorable, bill 114.	
42	Senate.	Mr. Sumner	Foreign Relations..	January 20, 1863.	Favorable, bill 114.	
		Mr. Frye	February 1, 1862.	Favorable.	
		Mr. Walker	January 18, 1862.	Favorable.	

(°) This bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, February 10, 1845; by yeas 26, nays 15, but not reached.

(*) This bill was voted by the Senate on the 9th of June, 1846; yeas 27, nays 23.

(†) This bill (being Mr. Clayton's bill as voted by the Senate) was voted by the House by yeas 94, nays 87. It thus passed both Houses, and was vetoed by President Polk as a Senate bill; and on the veto the Senate voted yeas 27, nays 13—not two-thirds.

(°) This bill was voted by the Senate; yeas 30, nays 26.

(*) This bill was voted by the House, y as 111, nays 77; and was voted by the Senate February 6, 1850, yeas, 28 nays 17, and was vetoed by President Pierce as a House bill; and the House vote on the veto was yeas 113, nays 81—not a two-thirds—so the bill was lost.

(†) This bill (Mr. Crittenden's, No. 45) was voted by the Senate on the 10th January, 1860; yeas 26, nays 20.

The General Assembly of Rhode Island has been equally persistent in asking for recognition of the justice of these claims and that provision be made for their payment. Upon examination of the schedules I find that action thereon has been taken as follows :

At the January session, 1832, p. 42, it was

“ *Resolved*, that our Senators in Congress be instructed to use their exertions to secure for our citizens all the compensation for French spoliations, which, by treaty with France or otherwise, may be constitutionally provided and secured.”

At the January session, 1844, (*Acts and Resolves*, p. 57,) on the report of the committee,

“ *Resolved*, that prior to the convention between the United States and France in 1800, there were large and just claims due from France to citizens of the United States, for spoliations on their commerce, which claims were asserted as just by the Government of the United States, and were not rejected by France :

“ *Resolved*, That by the ratification of said convention the Government of the United States released France from the payment of said claims, in consideration of a corresponding release from the claims of France against the United States, and from the obligations of the treaties which had before existed between the two nations : and that, in the opinion of this Assembly, the said mutual release has been of great advantage to the United States as a nation :

“ *Resolved*, That this was such an appropriation of private property to public use as, in the opinion of this Assembly, entitles the said citizens to just compensation from the government of the United States.

“ *Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions and the accompanying report be transmitted by the Secretary to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and that they be requested to use their exertions for procuring a just indemnification to said citizens.”

These resolutions were adopted upon recommendation of the committee to which the subject was referred. Their report was full and lucid, and is one of the most clear, brief

expositions extant, and is deserving of careful study. It is out of print, but ought now to be reprinted.

At the January session, 1846, (p. 92, *Schedules*,) we find that

"His Excellency the Governor having communicated to this General Assembly resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts strongly urging on the United States Government payment of the claims of American citizens for spoliations committed on their commerce, under authority of the French Government, anterior to the year 1800, the indemnity for which was assumed by the United States, and France released therefrom, by the convention of that year, ratified in 1801; and this General Assembly concurring in the opinion expressed by the Massachusetts legislature, and reaffirming the report and resolutions adopted at the January session, 1844, and accepting the report made by the committee at the present session: do therefore

"*Resolve*, That the said claims are honestly due, and that a longer-continued refusal of payment, after many favorable reports have been made by committees to both houses of Congress, would be a denial of justice by that august body, highly derogatory to its character, and flagrantly injurious to our national credit:

"*Resolved*, That his Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Governor of each State and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and that said Senators and Representatives be requested to use all honorable means and their most earnest efforts to procure the passage of an act which shall give full indemnity and ample justice to these long-delayed and much-injured claimants."

I have not been able to find the report of the committee here referred to. It was not published in the schedules of the General Assembly, and careful search in the vaults of the State House has been made for the original, but it cannot be found. I hope that anyone having a copy of it will make it known now, while all are so much interested in this subject.

In May, 1846, (*Schedules*, p. 73,) we find that the General Assembly again took action on this matter, as follows:

"Whereas, among the numerous class of American citizens who had just claims upon the Government of France for spoliation upon their commerce prior to the 30th of September, 1800, for which that government admitted its liability for adequate indemnities, are many citizens of this State: that, by the treaty of that date, the United States, in consideration of the release of the 'burdensome and onerous guaranties' stipulated in the treaties of 'alliance' and of 'amity and commerce' of 1778, fully exonerated and released the Government of France from such indemnities, and that, by subsequent conventions between the two Governments of April 30, 1803, for the cession and acquisition of Louisiana, the United States became legally and equitably obligated to their citizens for the aforesaid indemnities, yet they have not been satisfied in conformity to the conventions as aforesaid: and whereas, a bill appropriating five millions of dollars for the *pro rata* liquidation of said indemnities is now pending before Congress, therefore

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this General Assembly the aforesaid claims, with interest, are justly due and demandable of the Government of the United States;

"*Resolved, further*, That our Senators in Congress be, and are hereby instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to use their best exertions to procure from the government as full and adequate indemnities therefor as though said claims still existed against the Government of France, and to aid, by all proper means, the passage of any bill for the speedy liquidation thereof.

"*Resolved*, That his Excellency the Governor transmit copies of these resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives, and request them to lay the same before their respective Houses."

There is a very prevalent belief that these spoliation claims were paid, or settled for with France at the time of the Louisiana purchase. But this is a mistake. Lest it may be thought that the resolution of our General Assembly, which I have just read, proves this belief to be correct, I will explain briefly that on the 30th of April, 1803, there was concluded at Paris a treaty and two conventions between France and the United States. The treaty ceded Louisiana to the United States for eighty millions of francs. The first convention pro-

vided for the payment of sixty millions of francs, part of the eighty millions, in United States stock. The second convention provided for the payment of the "debts" embraced in the fifth article of the convention of 1800, which we have already considered, these "debts" being specifically explained not to include prizes whose condemnation was confirmed, but to include only supplies and embargoes. To pay these "debts" the remaining twenty millions of the eighty millions of francs was agreed to be paid by the United States to these creditors upon satisfactory proof thereof. These spoliation claims proper, arising from illegal captures and sale of American vessels, were therefore not included.

The last resolution of our General Assembly on this subject was in January, 1872, (*Schedules*, p. 225,) as follows:

"Resolution instructing the Rhode Island delegation in Congress to use their best exertions to provide for the payment of claimants for French spoliations prior to the year 1800.

"*Voted and Resolved*, (the Senate concurring herein), That the Senators of this State in Congress be, and the same are, hereby instructed, and that the Representatives of this State in Congress be, and the same are, hereby requested, to use their best exertions to procure the passage of an Act of Congress granting indemnity to citizens of the United States for French spoliations on American commerce prior to the year 1800."

In 1799 these claims were estimated at twenty millions of dollars in amount. Senator Sumner in his valuable report on this subject (*Senate Report No. 10, 41st Congress, second session*), deducted the payments made by France after that date, \$728,000; for debts paid by France under the last-mentioned convention of 1803, \$3,750,000; and payments made under the treaty of 1819 for vessels captured and sold in Spanish ports, \$2,848,000, leaving a balance of \$12,676,380. By a different method he arrived at nearly the same result, \$12,572,000. This would assume that all the losses can be legally proved, which, unfortunately, is by no means

the case. Many of the original papers are lost, mislaid or destroyed by fire or otherwise. Some were filed in Washington, sent to Paris by our government, and have disappeared. All the witnesses are dead, most of them leaving no legal evidence that can be used to prove these losses. It is doubtful if one quarter of these losses can be proved at the present day.

The act to provide for the ascertainment of these claims passed Congress, January 20th, 1885. It authorizes claimants for indemnity for acts of spoliation by the French prior to the convention of September 30th, 1800, to apply by petition to the United States Court of Claims. Thereupon the Court shall examine and determine the validity of the claims, their present ownership, and what assignment thereof, if any, has been made. The Attorney-General of the United States is directed to resist all claims presented by all proper legal defences. The Secretary of State is directed to procure all such evidence as can be procured from abroad as to these acts of spoliation, all of which, with all papers relating thereto on file in the Department of State in Washington, may be used by the claimants or by the United States. On the first Monday of December in each year the Court is directed to report to Congress the facts and conclusions reached in each case decided. All claims must be presented within two years from January 20th, 1885. The decisions of the Court are not final, however, as Congress expressly reserves the right under the act to pay or not to pay the claims, even after they are proved. But no doubt is felt that Congress will order the payment of claims found to be valid by the Court, especially if the amount prove to be small. The question is often asked whether Congress will pay interest also on the claims allowed. There can be no doubt interest should be paid, as the country has reaped the benefit for eighty-five years of the settlement then made for these claims; but the interest would amount to five times the principal, and should the claims allowed prove large in amount the sum total would prove appalling. Perhaps a low

rate of interest may be allowed,—perhaps, if the amount finally proved turns out to be small, Congress, in a burst of generosity, may direct it to be paid with interest.

Acting under the authority conferred by the Act of Congress, the Secretary of State sent the Hon. James Broadhead to Paris last summer to procure copies of the decrees of condemnation of the captured vessels from the French courts, etc., but it is reported he found they had all been destroyed during the various revolutions the French capital has undergone. This winter he is to visit the Windward Islands for the same purpose, and it is hoped he may be more successful in his search there. I have in my possession one of the decrees of condemnation by the court in Guadeloupe of one of our Rhode Island vessels, the schooner "Betsey," the best possible proof of the validity of the claim. I am often asked what proof is necessary to make out a case to be submitted to the Court of Claims. In the Custom House in Providence and Newport we find, bound in books, the registers of the vessels. The manifests should also be on file there, but not having been bound some of them are lost. Upon the return home of the captain after the capture of his vessel, in order to account for her disappearance, his protest, under oath, was filed, stating the facts connected with the capture, when made, where and by what court the vessel was condemned, etc. Then an entry was made on the back of the register, "Captured by the French," with the date, and perhaps a statement showing what French port the vessel was taken into, and sometimes a memorandum is added, "Captain's protest on file." This protest is always valuable evidence, because made at the time and without reference to its ever being used as evidence in the recovery of the loss. It was made, as such protests, so called, are made now, to account for the disappearance of the vessel and to discharge the sureties from further obligation on their bond. Should our government be able to recover the decrees of condemnation of the French tribunals in the ports of the Windward Islands, their coincidence with the evidence found here would be conclusive.

Upon examining the registers the small tonnage of the vessels is remarkable. Our ancestors carried on trade and business generally in a small way compared with the present way. These captured vessels varied from 18 to 165 tons, the latter being the largest I find on my list. Last summer all the evidence in our Custom Houses relating to this subject was ordered sent to Washington for use by either side as evidence in the trial of these petitions, according to the terms of the act of Congress. Before they went I made memoranda of them. Among the vessels captured I find the Neptune, Happy Return, Betsey, Sally, William, Favorite, Ruth, Fanny, Ranger, Franklin, Becca, Peyton Randolph, Greenwich, Union, Lily, William, Betsey, Nancy, Polly, Reliance, Good Intent, Patty, Sophia, Gen. Greene, Commerce, Eliza, Industry, Mary, Agnorina, Brandywine, Alice, Nancy, Orange, Sukey, Sukey, Nancy, Henry, Ranger, Caroline, Peace, Lydia, Union, Columbia, Joanna, Friendship, Edward, Minerva, Betsey, Friendship, Friendship, Diana, Rover, Clementina, and others. Among the names of owners of these vessels I find the names of Simeon Martin, Peleg Clarke, Caleb Gardner, William Vernon, Benjamin Fry, Nicholas Peck, Thomas Church, Joseph Wardwell, Shearjashub Bourne, Samuel Wardwell, Ebenezer Cole, Walter Channing, Archibald Crary, George Gibbs, Frederic Crary, John Cook, Ebenezer Woodward, Jr., Anson Nye, Solomon Nye, Nathaniel Gladding, Daniel Gladding, Charles Collins, Jr., Isaac Manchester, Edward Church, Henry Munroe, Thomas Butler, Styles Phelps, Aaron Usher, Levele Maxwell, Robert N. Auchmuty, John W. Russell, Nathaniel Howland, Allen Munroe, William Champlin, James Maxwell, Constant Taber, Simon Davis, William Gardner, William Britton, Stephen Arnold, William Arnold, Perry G. Arnold, John Bullock, Lemuel Bishop, Thos. L. Halsey, James Atwood, John I. Clarke, Samuel W. Greene, Daniel Mathewson, Noel Mathewson, Benjamin F. Carlile, Samuel Carlile, Daniel Allen, Samuel Allen, Moses Lippitt, Thomas Jackson, Edward Dickens, Benjamin Clifford, Edward Dexter, Samuel Butler, Seth Wheaton, Richard Jackson, Zach-

ariah Allen, Levi Bosworth, Samuel Aborn, Jr., Lowry Aborn, John A. Aborn, Cyrus Butler, Cyrus Northup, Jonathan Arnold, Eleazer Ellis, Joseph McClintock, Andrew Boyd, Rufus Williams, Wilson Jacobs, Thomas Sprague, Michael Anthony, Philip Peckham, Jr., Henry R. Cooper, Ebenezer Tyler, 3d, and others. I should be very glad to find out who are the heirs of many of these claimants, but I have not yet been able to. There are also claimants in Rhode Island for insurance losses paid by insurance companies. These claims can be preferred by petition signed by the company if still in existence, or by its assignee. The petition for the claim of an individual must be signed and preferred by his administrator.

I have two petitions signed by the original administrator, but generally speaking, an administrator *de bonis non* must first be appointed. As soon as one is appointed, but not until then, armed with his power of attorney and certified copy of his letter of administration I have the requisite authority to apply to the Department of State in Washington, and upon payment of the usual fees for copying, I am furnished with copies of whatever there may be on record there concerning the capture in question. This often supplements other proof already found here. I meet with some cases in which all the proofs of capture were retained here by the claimant, and in other instances they were all sent to Washington about the time of the capture, in response to the request of the Secretary of State. In some instances all the papers were placed in the hands of some member of Congress or of some lawyer, now dead, and no trace of them can now be found. The list of claimants and vessels published by the Government last winter (*Senate, Ex. Doc. No. 205*) is valuable and of great assistance, but is by no means exhaustive, because it includes only claims filed in Washington.

As to the bibliography of the subject, a list of books, articles, reports, speeches, &c., published in No. 71 of the Bulletin of the Public Library of Boston (vol. 6, No. 5) is of great value. And the message from the President

of the United States to the Senate, May 20, 1826, (*Senate Doc. No. 102*) already spoken of, contains all the correspondence, negotiations, &c., relating to this interesting chapter in our history, although it cannot be said to be one that redounds to the credit either of the United States or of France.

To conclude, in the eloquent words of Sumner :

"Of all claims in our history, these are most associated with great events and great sacrifices. First in time, they are also first in character, for they spring from the very cradle of the republic and the trials of its infancy. To comprehend them, you must know first, how independence was won ; and, secondly, how, at a later day, peace was assured. Other claims have been merely personal or litigious ; these are historic. Here were 'individual' losses, felt at the time most keenly, and constituting an unanswerable claim upon France, which were employed by our Government at a critical moment, like a credit or cash in hand, to purchase release from outstanding 'national' obligations, so that the whole country became, at once, the trustee of these sufferers, bound, of course, to gratitude for the means thus contributed, but bound also to indemnify them against these losses. And yet these sufferers, thus unique in situation, have been compelled to see all other claims for foreign spoliation satisfied while they alone have been turned away. As early as 1794 our plundered fellow citizens obtained compensation, to the amount of more than ten million dollars, on account of British spoliation. Several indemnities have been obtained since from Spain, Naples, Denmark, Mexico, and the South American states, while, by the famous convention of 1831, France contributed five million dollars to the satisfaction of spoliation under the continental system of Napoleon. Spain stipulated to pay for every ship or cargo taken within Spanish waters even by the French, so that the French spoliation on our commerce within Spanish waters have been paid for, but French spoliation on our commerce elsewhere before 1800 are still unredeemed. Such has been the fortune of claimants the most meritorious of all.

In all other cases there has been simply a claim for foreign spoliation, but without any superadded obligation on the part of our Government. Here is a claim for foreign spolia-

tions, the precise counterpart of all other claims, but with a superadded obligation, on the part of our Government, in the nature of a debt, constituting an *assumpsit*, or implied promise to pay; so that these sufferers are not merely *claimants* on account of French spoliations, but they are also *creditors* on account of a plain assumption by the Government of the undoubted liability of France. The appeal of these *claimant-creditors* is enhanced beyond the pecuniary interests involved when we consider the nature of this assumption, and especially that, in this way, our country obtained a final release from embarrassing stipulations with France contracted in the war for national independence. Regarding it, therefore, as a *debt*, it constitutes a part of that sacred debt incurred for national independence, and is the only part remaining unpaid."

AN OLD BELL.—Considerable curiosity has been excited in this town by the factory bell which has been put up within a few days, recently purchased from among the celebrated Spanish bells in New York. The inscription we give below, and our readers can form their own opinions as to the antiquity of the bell. However that may be, its tone is certainly most melodious and musical, far more so than most of the bells of more recent manufacture.

SEHILOESTA
CAMPAPASIE
NDOGVARDIA
NELM. RP. PREDI
CADORGENER
A'L. E. R. RAE AEL
ANTONIO. GARCIA
ANODEI 828

SAN. RAE AEL Y. SAN. ERAN
SISCOROGAD. PRO. NOSO.
TROS.

The translation of which is said to be as follows:

"This bell, which God preserve, has been given by General F. R. Rafael Antonio Garcia, in the year of God 828.

"Saint Rafael and Saint Francisco pray for us."

—*Bristol Phenix, March 3, 1838.*

NOTE.—We print this in order to call attention to the fact that often escapes a careless reader, who reads this and at once leaps to the conclusion that this is one of the oldest bells in the country. The date is given 828. The word "General" is enough to attest the age, and then the Saints whose names are given and the General who presents it. These will call a student to a good cyclopedia for confirmation to which we refer. We think 1828 would be nearer its date than 828, and we would like to know where this bell is now.

A MYTHICAL PEDIGREE.

CONTRIBUTED BY RAY GREENE HULING, FITCHBURG, MASS.

FOR the following line of descent from Adam to the early Arnolds of Rhode Island no claim of accuracy is put forth. It is given merely for what it is worth, and, in the opinion of the author, that is very little. It occurred to him one stormy vacation week to follow back the well-known Arnold family tree, which has its root in Jestyn, King of Glaumorgan, so far as material should be available. Woodward's *History of Wales*, Powell's *Caradoc's History of Wales*, and an article in *Penn. Historical Magazine*, vol. iv. (1880), were examined in the course of the search. A printed statement underlies every step in the chain, but the author would prefer not to be responsible for the truth of all that is in print.

I think genealogists are agreed that the Arnold pedigree is correctly established to Roger Arnold of Llanthony, but differ as to the line of descent reaching back to Jestyn. It is not difficult to accept its probable accuracy from that point back to Cadwalladr, for it deals with historic names. Beyond this the Welsh Rolls are the authority. To these credence was given in former times, but is not now, I think, by reputable students of genealogy, though the funeral customs of the bards give some color of probability to the reported genealogies of the royal families. Of course, when the line leaves Britain and includes the names of classic story, it becomes purely mythical, although the Welsh explanation is at least interesting. The theory is that the classic heroes and gods were only heads of families who had become deified after death. At the very end of the line we become attached to the genealogy of the book of Genesis, though the names in coming through the Welsh have assumed a slightly unfamiliar form.

It is possible that some genealogists of a hypercritical turn

will deem an apology due for having allowed this—macaronic genealogy, shall I call it?—to be dignified with a printed appearance. I have to offer only the urgent request of our genial Editor. Seeing him in serious doubt as to his descent from the “grand old gardener,” I cannot refrain from giving him the comfort that arises from seeing one’s ancestors named in print.

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 Adda (Adam), | 38 Antonius, |
| 2 Seth, | 39 Aedd Mawr, |
| 3 Enos, | 40 Cynwarch, |
| 4 Methusalem, | 41 Dodion, |
| 5 Lamech, | 42 Dyfnwall, |
| 6 Noahen, | 43 Beli, |
| 7 Japheth, | 44 Gurgan, |
| 8 Javan, | 45 Cyhelyn, |
| 9 Chetim, | 46 Seissyll, |
| 10 Ciprius, | 47 Dan, |
| 11 Coelus, | 48 Morudd, |
| 12 Saturnus, | 49 Elidr mawr, |
| 13 Jupiter, | 50 Geraint, |
| 14 Dardan, | 51 Caddell, |
| 15 Ericthonius. | 52 Coel, |
| 16 Iros, | 53 Porrex, |
| 17 Assaracus, | 54 Kerryr, |
| 18 Capius, | 55 Andrew, |
| 19 Anchises, | 56 Uriew, |
| 20 Aeneas, | 56 Genedawc, |
| 21 Ascanius, | 87 Iago, |
| 22 Silvius, | 88 Tegid, |
| 23 Brutus, | 89 Padarn Perfrydd, |
| 24 Locrinus, | 90 Adeirn, |
| 25 Medoc, | 91 Cynedda Weledig, |
| 26 Membyr, | 92 Eineon Irth, |
| 27 Evroc Cadarn, | 93 Caffwallan Lawhis, |
| 28 Brutus Darianlas, | 94 Maelgwn Gwynedd, |
| 29 Lleon. | 95 Rhun, |
| 30 Rum baladr Cras, | 96 Beli, |
| 31 Blenddut, | 97 Iags, |
| 32 Lyn, | 98 Cadfan, (603), |
| 33 Regan. | 99 Cadwallan, |
| 34 Cunedda, | 100 Cadwallar, (d. 688), Last |
| 35 Riwallon, | King of the Britons; |
| 36 Gorwst, | 101 Idwallo, (d. 720), |
| 37 Seissyllt, | 102 Roderick Moelwynoc(d. 755) |

57 Ithel,	103 Conan Dyndoethwy (d. 818),
58 Clydawr,	104 Eisllyt, (Queen of Wales),
59 Clydm,	105 Roderick Mawr, the Great,
60 Gorwst,	(d. 876),
61 Muriawn,	106 Morgan Heu, or Mawr, (d.
62 Blenddud,	972), King of Glaumorgan;
63 Caph,	107 Owen, " "
64 Owain,	108 Ithel Dhu, " "
65 Seissyllt,	109 Gwrgaut, " "
66 Arthvael,	110 Jestyn, " "
67 Eidiol,	111 Nestm. Ynir, King of Gwent,
68 Rytherich,	112 Meiric,
69 Saml Penissel,	113 Ynir Vichan,
70 Pyrr,	114 Caradoc,
71 Cappoir,	115 Dyfnwall,
72 Monogen,	116 Syssylth, (d. 1175),
73 Beli Mawr,	117 Arthur,
74 Affleth,	118 Meiric,
75 Owen,	119 Gwillim,
76 Duve Brichwain,	120 Arnholt,
77 Omwedd,	121 Arnholt Vychan,
78 Amwerid,	122 Arnhoit,
79 Gorddufu,	123 Roger Arnold of Llanthony,
80 Dufu,	124 Thomas Arnold,
81 Gwrtholi,	125 Richard Arnold,
82 Doli,	126 Richard Arnold of Baghere,
83 Gwrgain,	(d. 1595),
84 Cain,	127 Thomas Arnold of Melcome
85 Genedawc,	Horsey.

This Thomas was father of William and Thomas who settled in Rhode Island, and who were the ancestors of most of the men in the State.

R. G. H.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We are much obliged to our friend Huling for the trouble he has taken to run this line back to the "old gardener," and trust that our readers will be as much amused as we have been in reading the list. To continue the list to ourself, we have to add:

128 Thomas, b. 1599; d. Sept., 1674.	132 Seth, b. January 6, 1740; d. —.
129 Richard, b. Mar. 22, 1642; d. April 22, 1710.	133 Richard, b. —; d. Aug. 27, 1844.
130 John, b. —, 1671; d. Oct. 27, 1756.	134 James L., b. April 24, 1812.
131 Seth, b. July 26, 1706; d. —, 1801.	135 James N., b. August 3, 1844.

Deed from Alexander to the Proprietors of Providence.

Recorded in old Book No. 3, Prov. Records, page 450.

CONTRIBUTED BY FRED A. ARNOLD.

PROVIDENCE 1. 12. 1661 (so calld)

Be it knowne vnto all men by these presents y^t I waumsittou or sepaugt Chiefe Sachim of paukanawqut doe by these presents for y^e Consideration of one hundreth fath: of wampam and other Gifts Receaued make & pass ouer vnto Tho: Olney Sen^r John Sayles: John Browne: Val. Whitman & Roger Williams all my right and interest Claime and Challenge vnto my Lands grounds or meadows 'lying & being on y^e west side of Secunk or pau-tuckqut riuer for the vse of the Towne of providence Excepting a tract of land about fowre or fiue miles w^{ch} I gaue leaue to William or Quashawaunamut of massachuset to dispose of w^{ch} sayd land begins at the old field of wasquodomisk and whereas I have no interest in any land beiond that tract assigned to william aforesaid only some subiects of mine lay Claime to the next tract of land beiond y^t of william his tract Calld mashackquift I doe promise to deale with my said subiects to treate and agree with providence men if they please before any other English in witnes of the premises I set to mine

in y^e presence of

DANIELL WILLIAMS.

hand & Seale



JOSEPH WILLIAMS.

y^e m^{rk} of

A

Alexander

JOHN SASUMAN

alias Waumsittou & Sepaugt

the mark

H

of Tom wachemo
ket

Enroled y^e 22nd of Janeuary: 1667: p me SHADRACH MANTON
Towne Clerke

When the purchase of and settlement at Providence was made in 1636, Massasoit had subjected himself and the tribes under him to the Narragansetts, and the original deed called the TOWN EVIDENCE was given by Canonicus and Miantonomi in their capacity of Chief Sachems of both tribes ; but soon after, taking advantage of their relations with the Plymouth and Bay governments, they renounced their allegiance to the Narragansetts and were released from their subjection, and the petty tribes to the north and west of Providence adhering to Massasoit, laid claim to large tracts of lands thereabout. In 1646 a committee of the town was appointed to negotiate with them, and bargained with Massasoit for all his right in the lands between the town bounds at Pawtucket and Louisiquiset ; the deed having been drawn ready for signing, and an agreement having been made as to the amount of wampam and commodities to be paid, the committee proceeded to Portsmouth to procure the same ; but on returning and tendering the agreed articles, Massasoit refused to sign the deed unless an increase in the amount of the gratuities be given him. This the committee refused, and so reported to the town, with a copy of the agreement and the unsigned deed.¹ Nothing further seems to have been done at this time ; but in acknowledgment of this unsatisfied claim, there was inserted in most of the deeds of land in this locality given between the English settlers from 1640 to 1660 the following clause, "provided that if the town shall be put to any charge about Indians, that he or they that doth possess the land shall pay their share." (See deeds of William Reynolds,² John Sayles, William Blaxton, and others, of lands on the Pawtucket river.)

June 13, 1660, Massasoit being then dead, Wamsitta appeared at the Plymouth Court³ with another Indian called William and laid claim to certain lands that had been sold by a Narragansett sachem, who, as they recite, "hath nor never had no interest in it." This claim was referred to Capt. Willett, and

¹ R. I. Colonial Records, I, 31-34.

² Providence Transcript, pp. 76-78.

³ Plymouth Colony Records, III, 192.

no further action appears on Plymouth Records; but soon after, the deed now given was made, followed by one from the Indian, William.

Alexander, alias Waumsittou, Wamsutta, Sepauqut, and Moocanam, was the son of Massasoit and elder brother of King Philip, who succeeded him as Sachem. He first appears under the name of Moocanam in 1639, Sept. 25, when with his father Vssamequin (Massasoit) he renewed and ratified the ancient league between Plymouth Colony and the Wampanoag tribes.¹ His wife was Namumpam, alias Tatapanum, alias Weetamoo, squaw-Sachem of Pocasset, "as potent a prince as any round about her, and hath as much corn, land and men at her command."² When a prisoner at Plymouth in 1662, he was taken sick and allowed to return home, upon condition that his son should be sent as a hostage for his return upon recovery.³ No name is given for this son, and I find no other mention of any children.

After the death of Alexander, Weetamoo married one Pet-onowowet, who deserted her at the outbreak of Philip's war and joined the English, whereupon, believing that the colonists had poisoned Alexander, her first husband, and seduced from her, her second, she now joined with Philip in the prosecution of the war, and crossing over to the Narragansett country she married Quianopen, alias Panoquin, a cousin of Canonchet and a leader in the war, who was captured and shot at Newport, Aug. 26, 1676. She was drowned about the 6th of the same month while attempting to cross to Pocasset. Her body was found at Mattapoiset by the English, who cut off her head and set it upon a pole at Taunton, when by the cries and lamentations of the Indian prisoners it was discovered to be the head of Weetamoo.

From 1639 to 1660, about which time his father died, Alexander appears to have been associated with him in the govern-

¹ Plymouth Colony Records, I, 133.

² Present State of New England, p. 3.

³ Hubbard, I, 51.

ment of the tribe, much as Canonicus and Miantonomi were over the Narragansetts. He joined his father in various sales of land, and sometimes his name appears alone, to deeds that were afterwards ratified by Massasoit.

June 13, 1660, he appeared at the Plymouth Court,¹ and upon his petition the following action was taken: "Att the earnest request of Wamsitta, desiring that in regard his father is lately deceased, and hee being desirouse, according to the custome of the natiues, to change his name, that the Court would Confer an English name vpon him, which accordingly they did, and therefore ordered, that for the future hee shalbee called by the name of Allexander Pokanokett; and desiring the same in behalf of his brother they have named him Phillip." This action shows that Massasoit was dead previous to June 13, 1660, after which date but little appears in authentic records regarding Alexander.

April 8, 1661, he sold to Capt. Thomas Willett a tract of land called the "Rehoboth North Purchase," which included the present town of Cumberland, R. I., Attleborough, and parts of Mansfield and Norton, Mass. During the year 1661 he appeared at the Plymouth Court and "challenged Quabauke Indians to belong to him, and further said that he did warr against Vncas this summer on that account." This was a tribe of the Nipmuck Indians, near the present town of Brookfield, Mass. Early in 1662 complaint was made that Alexander was contriving mischief against the English, and he was summoned to Plymouth to make answer. Not appearing at the appointed time, he was arrested, with some of his people, and hastily carried to Major Winslow's house, where he was held as a prisoner. Here he suddenly fell sick, and was allowed to return home, where in two or three days he died.

John Sasuman, or Sassamon, was by birth a Massachusetts Indian, "his father and mother living at Dorchester, and both died Christians." (I. Mather.)

¹ Plymouth Colony Records, III, 392.

² Drake's Indians, II, 103.

He learned the English language, could read and write, had translated some of the Bible into the Indian language, and had been employed as a schoolmaster, to teach his countrymen at Natick. He left the English for some dislike, and went to live with Alexander, and afterward with Philip, by whom he was made a secretary. Becoming restless he returned again to the English, and was baptised and received into the Indian church, and becoming a preacher, was sent to the Nemaskets near Middleboro, whose chief, Watuspaquin, deeded him land in 1674 to induce him to remain among them, as he did also to his son-in-law, one Felix, who had married his daughter Assowetough, called by the English, Betty Sasemore. While living here, he learned of the intention of Philip to make war upon the whites, and communicated this information to the Governor at Plymouth, soon after which, his body was found in Assawomset Pond, as the English believed, murdered for the part he had taken in notifying them of the Indian plot. Three Indians were arrested, tried, and hung for this murder, and their hanging was the signal for the opening of the war, which was sooner than had been designed by Philip.¹

Tom of Watchemoket, the last witness to this deed and the grantor in the preceding deed of December 10, 1661, was probably an under sachem of a tribe of the Wampanoags, and appears to have been a councillor and interpreter under Massasoit, Alexander and Philip. In the deed of August 9, 1646, made by Massasoit, but never executed, is the following clause, "I do hereby authorize Saunkussecit alias Tom of Wauchimoqut to mark trees and set the bounds of the land aforesaid."²

The deed of December 10, 1661, he signed as "Maugin call'd Tom of Wauchimoqut." In 1667 he was witness to a deed made by Philip to Constant Southworth and others, which he signed as "Tom alias Sawsuett an interpreter."³ Another deed of Philip's in 1668 he signs as "Tom Sansuwest, Inter-

¹ Drake's Indians, III, 8-12.

² R. I. Colonial Records, I, 31.

³ Book of the Indians, III, 14.

preter.” Again in 1672 he signs as “Thomas alias Sank-suit.”

The country called Watchemoket was on the east side of the Providence and Blackstone rivers, and extended from about Watchemoket Cove, opposite Field’s Point, northerly to the Ten Mile River, embracing the northerly part of the present town of East Providence. The point of land on the opposite side of the river where the westerly abutment of Red Bridge now stands was also called Wachamoquitt, as is shown by the following action of the town, December 17, 1664: “It is granted unto Arthur Fenner that he may have the Meere Bank beginning at the corner of his fence by his now dwelling house and so to go round the points unto a little creek or cove lying next unto Wachamoquitt point, and to have it upon this condition, laying down so much land in another place for the town use, and also to make three stiles, one by his house, another at the hollow *near Wachamoquitt point*, and another at the aforesaid creek or cove, and that people may have liberty to pass thro’ on foot, or upon occasion to land goods upon the said land, &c.” This “Meere Bank” was the bluff or river bank from the vicinity of “What Cheer Rock” around the present location of Gano and Pitman streets to the point. The creek spoken of is crossed by Pitman street, and Waterman street has been filled across the “cove” in recent years.

In a deed dated April 14, 1641,¹ from the town of Providence to William Arnold, of several lots of land, one of them was described as “lying upon the neck of the town upon a point over against Wachamoquott.” January 11, 1642-3, in making a deed to Thomas Olney, William Arnold reserves his lot of land “lying upon the neck of the town before the poynt of Watchamoquut.”² This lot he afterwards sold to Arthur Fenner, and describes it as “lying upon the neck or point calld What Cheere.”

¹ Book of the Indians, III, 14.

² Book of the Indians, III, 15.

³ Providence Transcript, p. 175.

⁴ Providence Transcript, p. 67.

⁵ Providence Transcript, p. 43.

✓ Joseph Williams, the youngest son of Roger and Mary (Warnard) Williams, was born, says the record, "At Providence about the beginning of December, 1643, (so called)." His father was then in England engaged in procuring the first Charter which was signed March 14, 1643-4, and did not return until Sept. 17, 1644, when Joseph was over nine months old.

His gravestone in the Williams burying ground at Roger Williams Park gives his birth as 1644, but a family memorandum book, once the property of Joseph Williams, Sen., and afterwards of his sons, Joseph, Jr., and James, gives the date as December 12, 1643,¹ which agrees with the record made by his father.

1661, February 24. He received "a purchase right" from the town,² as did also his brother Daniel.

1661-2. Received from town 19 acres on the neck on the east side of great swamp and near the place called the new fields.³

1665, February 19. Drew No. 43 in a division of lands.

1666, May 31. Engaged allegiance to King Charles II.

1669, December 17. He married Lydia, the youngest daughter of Thomas and Mary (Small) Olney, the brother of the bride, Thomas Olney, Jr., assistant, performing the marriage ceremony.⁴ That he had already provided himself with a home is shown by a deed from the town dated May 27, 1670,⁵ of 20 acres, on his purchase right "lying between the great pond called Mashapauge and the meadow called Mashapauge meadows *and near unto the now dwelling-house* of the said Joseph Williams and on the north side thereof;" the south bound of his land was the line between Providence and Pawtuxet, running from the head of Sasafrax Cove to Mashapauge.

The homestead upon which Joseph Williams appears to

¹ Rider's Book Notes, II, 26.

² Providence Transcript, p. 152.

³ Providence Transcript, p. 7.

⁴ Providence Transcript, p. 444.

⁵ Providence Transcript, p. 8.

have been living in 1670, five years before Philip's war, and thirteen years before the death of his father, was south and south-east of Mashapauge pond, and a considerable portion of it is now called Roger Williams Park. This land was probably received by Joseph Williams from the town upon his own right, but no record evidence exists of this, nor is there any record to show that it ever belonged to Roger Williams, and given, or sold by him to his son. I think, however, it is safe to say that Roger Williams never owned this land, except in the sense that he owned all the town, until he made the deed to the proprietors in 1638.

1673. Laid out by the town 60 acres of land to Joseph Williams, it being part of his purchase right, bounded easterly on lot of Arthur Fenner, that he bought of John Lippitt, west with land of William Fenner and the common.¹

1675, April 12. Was No. 41 in a division of lands on the west side of the seven mile line.

1679. Served in King Philip's war.

1679, July 1. Taxed 6s 3d.

1683-84-93-96-97-98 and 1713, Deputy.

1684-85-86-87-88-91-93-94, 1713-14-15, Town Council.

1685, November 17. Received from town² 56½ acres of land, about five miles north-west from Providence and adjoining on the east of other lands laid out to him.

1688. Rateable estate, 2 oxen, 1 horse, 1 steere, 6 cows, 4 three years, 4 two years, 3 yearlings, 1 colt, 10 acres pasture, 3½ shares meadow.

1697. John Sayles sells to his uncle Joseph Williams a piece of meadow called Many Holes.³

1698-99 and 1700 to 1707, Assistant.

1698, March 10. To receive a shilling from every person to pay for running their lines of lots on the west of the seven mile line.

1699, May 12 and September 20.⁴ He bought from Stephen

¹ Providence Transcript, p. 276.

² Providence Deeds, I, 133.

³ Providence Deeds, I, 254.

⁴ Providence Deeds, I, 259; vol. II., p. 326.

Cornell and Mary Strange, widow of Lott Strange, for £95, 400 acres of land at Rocky Hill, bounded east by Mashapauge Pond, west by Pauchaset river, and south by land of William Vincent.

1699, October 25. On a committee to inspect laws, &c.

1700, January 27. Sold to John Sayles for £70 a mesuage farm of 210 acres about seven or eight miles north-west from the salt water or harbour in Providence.¹

1707, November 3. Bought of Joseph Carpenter of Musketo Cove, Oyster Bay, Queens County, Long Island, Province of. New York, great-grandson of William Carpenter of Pawtuxet, all rights in one-half of that cove near the place called the landing-place cove in Pawtuxet.²

1711, August 6. Sold to James Whipple "a 40 foot lot that did of right belong to me from the town of Providence Shadrach Manton's lot on the south, Valentine Whitman's on the north and extending westerly 40 foot in width from the town street to the salt water."³

1715, September 17. Peleg Williams, son of Daniel, sells to his uncle Joseph all interest in lands in Pawtuxet Neck.⁴

1716-17, January 5. He sells the same to sons Thomas, Joseph, and James.⁵

1717, October 26. Signed will,⁶ making his wife Lydia and son James, Adm. He gave his son Thomas 330 acres of land at Rocky Hill, "where he now dwelleth," and other small parcels and rights.

To son Joseph one-half of land at Masipauge, about 130 acres, to be taken on the westward side thereof, adjoining to his house where he now dwelleth, &c.

To son James he gave 200 acres of land at Rocky Hill adjoining land given to son Thomas. Also one-half of home-stead farm at Masipague, being the east part adjoining "to

¹ Providence Deeds, I, 255.

² Providence Deeds, II, 82.

³ Providence Deeds, II, 198.

⁴ Providence Deeds, II, 472.

⁵ Providence Deeds, III, 4.

⁶ Providence Wills, II, 195.

my house," about 130 acres, with the dwelling house, &c. "But my loving wife Lydia Williams shall have the command, benefit and use of that Roome in my said House called the outward Roome wherein I now dwell, during the term of her natural life."

To his wife he gives the bed "wherein I vsally Lodg with all the furniture thereunto belonging."

All other moveables, together with all cattle, sheep, swine and horse kind he gives to son James, he to pay all debts, and provide for his mother during her life. This will was proved Oct. 12, 1724. Inventory £55 4s 2d.

1720, May 2. He made deeds to his sons of the lands given them in the above will.¹

1721-2, February 3. He sells to his three sons equally, his purchase right in lands on the westward side of the seven mile line.²

His death occurred August 17, 1724, his oldest son Thomas dying the 27th of the same month, and his wife Lydia surviving him only 23 days, her death occurring Sept. 9. Her will was dated Sept. 3 and proved Oct. 12, all property to go to son James and he appointed Adm.³

✓ JOSEPH WILLIAMS² (*Roger*) b. in Providence December 12, 1643; d. August 17, 1724; m. December 17, 1669, Lydia, youngest daughter of Thomas and Mary (Small) Olney; b. 1645; d. Sept. 9, 1724. Children:

1. JOSEPH, b. Sept. 26, 1670, and on the second day of the week; d. young.
2. THOMAS, b. Feb. 16, 1671-2; d. Aug. 27, 1724. (See Prov. Wills II., 195.) Married Mary, d. of James and Mary (Hawkins) Blackmar, who d. July 1, 1717. Children: 1 Joseph, 2 Thomas, 3 Stephen, 4 John, 5 Abigail, 6 Jonathan, 7 Mary.

¹ Providence Deeds, IV, 170-172-203-205.

² Providence Deeds, V, 134.

³ Providence Wills, II, 199.

3. JOSEPH, b. Nov. 10, 1673; d. Aug. 15, 1752. (See Prov. Wills, III., 306.) Married Lydia, d. of Benjamin and Lydia Hearnden, who died 1763. Children: 1, Mercy, 2 Jeremiah, 3 Mary, 4 Lydia, 5 Martha, 6 Barbara, 7 Freeloove, 8 Jemimah, 9 Meribah, 10 Patience.
4. MARY, b. June, 1676; d. —; m. probably James, s. of Eleazer and Alice (Angell) Whipple, who died Oct. 3, 1731; m. (2d) John, s. of John and Wait (Waterman) Rhodes. Children: 1 Eleazer Whipple, 2 James Rhodes.
5. JAMES, b. Sept. 24, 1680; d. June 25, 1757; m. Elizabeth, d. of James and Mary (Hawkins) Blackmar, b. 1682; d. March, 1761. Children: 1 James, 2 Anne, 3 Sarah, 4 Joseph, 5 Mary, 6 Nathaniel, 7 Elizabeth, 8 Hannah, 9 Lydia, 10 Nathan.
6. LYDIA, b. April 26, 1683; died Aug. 17, 1725. Unm.
7. PROVIDENCE.

THE CHANGE FROM OLD TO NEW STYLE.—In early dates pertaining to the history of Rhode Island previous to 1752, all dates between the first of January and the twenty-fifth of March bore the date of two years—thus, “The first church was organized in Providence, March 16, 1638–39.” March was called the first month notwithstanding the fact that the new year began on the 25th of March. This has led to much uncertainty concerning the precise date of many important events, the first month of the new year beginning twenty-five days before the year itself. But by an act of Parliament the calendar year 1752 began on the first of January, and the date January 1, 1752, is found in public documents instead of January 1, 1751–2. By an act of Parliament a correction of 11 days in the day of the month took place September 3d, 1752, that day being written September 14th. As a consequence, the month of September, 1752, has but nineteen days in it, the shortest month on record.

1812, March 1st. Married in Albany, N. Y., Seth Arnold, of Smithfield, R. I., to Magdalin Quackenboss, daughter of Isaac A. Quackenboss of Guilderland.—*Providence Gazette*.

ORIGIN OF NAME EAST GREENWICH.

WE believe the subjoined extracts relative to Greenwich in England afford a reasonable ground for believing that the town of East Greenwich in Rhode Island was named for Greenwich in England, and that some of the most prominent of its early settlers may have come from, or from the vicinity of, its namesake in our mother country.

The fact that our East Greenwich bore for a time the name of Dedford (a misspelling, perhaps, for Deptford), that the counties of both towns are alike named Kent, that the towns are similarly situated upon the water, and that both have Wickford and Kingston (or Kingstown) not far away strengthens the grounds for such a conclusion.

If anything stronger can be brought to support this theory it is the fact that when the town was incorporated in 1680 it was styled East Greenwich, when there was no West Greenwich in existence, which latter town was a creation of the last century, as can be seen by a reference to the "State Manual."

We would like to have an expression of opinion from those having information upon the subject.

We are under obligations to L. P. Spencer, Esq., of Washington, D. C., for copies of the following extracts and other valuable suggestions.

Extract from an old book entitled "A Perambulation of Kent," written by Wm. Lambard, and published in London in 1576:

"Greenwiche, in Latine, Viridis sinus: in Saxon *3nenawic* [Grenawic]; that is to say, the Greene Town, In ancient evidences, East Greenwiche, for difference sake from Depforde, which in old instruments is called west greenwiche."

The following is from Ireland's History of County Kent, England, vol. iv., p. 692:

"Greenwich lies next to Deptford, eastward, on the bank of the Thames, Blackheath being situated on the upper or southern

side. It was called in Latin *Grenovicum viridis sinus* a viridariis, in Saxon, Grenawic, that is the green town or dwelling on the bank of the river, which last syllable is now corrupted into *wich*; and in ancient evidences it was called East Greenwich, to distinguish it from Deptford, which was called West Greenwich."

EARLY HISTORY OF NARRAGANSETT.

R. I. Historical Society Collections, vol. iii., p. 307, 1885, etc.

CONTRIBUTED BY STEUBEN JENKINS, ESQ., WYOMING, PENN.

BULL—JENKINS.

HENRY BULL came, 1635, in the James from London, age 25, through Boston and Sandwich, Mass., to Narragansett, R. I. He was born in England, 1610. Came to R. I., 1637, and died 22nd of 2d mo. 1693-4, age about 84. Another authority says he came to London from South Wales.

He married Elizabeth —, about 1636, who died 1st of 8th mo. 1665. He married for his second wife, 14th of 12th mo. 1666, Esther Allen, born 8th Dec. 1648, died 26th of 1st mo. 1676. She was daughter of Ralph and Esther Swift Allen of Sandwich. Ralph was brother of George Allen, Sr., and his wife daughter of William and Joan Swift, all of Sandwich, Mass. He married for his third wife Ann (Clayton), widow of Gov. Nicholas Easton, 28th March, 1677. She conveyed a lot of land in Newport (Ann Bull) in her own name and right in 1702, and died ye 30 of ye 11 mo. 1707-8.

Henry Bull was Governor of Rhode Island from May, 1685, to May, 1686, and from Feb. 1689, to May, 1690.

Gov. HENRY BULL' had by first wife, Elizabeth, a son Jirah,' (variously spelled Jireh, Jareth.) By his second wife Esther Allen had a daughter, Esther, born —, 1666, died —, 1676. No child by third wife Ann.

JIRAH,³ born in Portsmouth, Sept. 1638; m. —. They had children:

HENRY³, b. —, 1658; d. —, 1690. He m. Ann Cole, dau. of John Cole, of Narragansett.

JIRAH³, (of whom presently,) b. Sept. 26, 1659; d. 16th July, 1702.

EPHRAIM³, (of whom presently.)

EZEKIEL³, m. Elizabeth —.

MARY³, m. James Coggeshall, b. 17th Feb. 1660; d. 2nd April, 1712. She was b. 1661; d. 13th June, 1754, age 93 years.

JIRAH³, (*Jirah², Gov. Henry¹*), m. Godsgift Arnold, dau. of Benedict. She died 23d April, 1691. They had children:

JIRAH⁴, b. 1682.

BENJAMIN⁴, b. 1685, Sept. 5.

BENEDICT⁴, b. 1688.

EPHRAIM³, (*Jirah², Gov. Henry¹*), of So. Kingstown; m. 1st Mary Coggeshall, dau. of John of Newport, 27th Oct., 1692. She was born 10th March, 1662. They had:

i. MARY⁴, b. 30th July, 1693; m. Peleg Mumford.

ii. REBECCA⁴, b. 27th July, 1697; m. Samuel Hayden.

iii. CONTENT⁴, b. 24th Nov. 1699; m. Job Jenkins, 15th Nov. 1724.

He married for second wife Hannah Holloway, or Holway, 20th June, 1700. She was born 1st March, 1667. They had children:

vi. EPHRAIM⁴, } m. Patience Rodman, of Thomas.
vii. HANNAH⁴, } Twins. Born 18th April, 1702.

v. HANNAH⁴, }

vi. MARY⁴,

vii. AMEY⁴, m. Joseph Coggeshall.

JOB¹ JENKINS, son of Zachariah, was born in Sandwich, Mass., 5th June, 1699; died in West Greenwich in 1757. He married, 15th of 11th month, 1724, Content Bull¹, dau. of Ephraim³, of S. Kingstown. She was born 24th Nov. 1699; d. 6th May, 1752. They had a large family of children, of whom I know the names of but four:

JOB³.

EPHRAIM², captain in Col. Holmes' Battalion, N. J., 14th June, 1780.

REBECCA², m. Thomas Sluman. Recorded 16th July, 1761.

MARY², N. Kingstown, b. 31st March, [year burned off.]

Job¹ married for second wife, 18th Jan., 1753, Prudence Ealy, of East Greenwich; Rebecca Jenkins, witness. Prudence, the widow, m. John Hall, 10th Aug., 1758. Job¹ in his will dated 25th Feb., 1757, gives to wife —; to son Job, house and lands, and a bequest to daughter Rebecca. Inventory of estate, £630, 10, 0; books, £13, 10, 0.

I would like to know more about Job's family.

BULL—ALBRO.

HENRY BULL¹, Governor, m. Elizabeth —. They had :

JIREH, born 1638-9.

HENRY, ESTHER, MARY.

JIREH², born 1638-9; m. —. They had :

JIREH, HENRY, EZEKIEL,

EPHRAIM, m. 1700, second wife, Hannah Holway.

EPHRAIM², by second wife, Hannah Holway, had :

HANNAH, MARY, AMEY,

EPHRAIM, born 1602-4-18; m. 1726.

EPHRAIM³, born 18th of 4th mo. 1702; m. Patience Rodman. They had, among others :

PATIENCE³, who m. Samuel Albro, b. 1751; who had

THOMAS ALBRO⁴, b. 5-9-1779; m. Ever Tice;

SAMUEL, WAITE, ALICE, HANNAH.

This Bull genealogy was furnished to John P. Albro by Charles A. Bull, of Lisle, Ill. I prefer the other, though possibly not perfectly correct. J. S.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—We are very grateful to those of our readers that have sent in their subscriptions to us since our last issue, and we earnestly request all others who have not not done so will confer the like favor upon us. We urgently need all our dues, and as our circulation is limited, of course we feel all delays of this nature seriously.

No magazine can live unless the editor and his readers work together. The REGISTER feels that it has a generous class of patrons and readers that can see and appreciate an honest and persistent effort to compile and publish unwritten facts in regard to our State history. The REGISTER has labored long and patiently, and has done a grand work and is capable of doing still better and effective service in the future.

We entreat therefore that our friends will join us heartily and will aid us in every way possible in extending our circulation, and in providing us with funds in order to work to better advantage. The editor pledges himself to spare no pains on his part and entreats his friends to spare none on their part. Will they do this? Let each one do his part faithfully and not wait for another to do it for them. If each one will do his part then the future success of the REGISTER is assured.

THANKS.—We have received several letters speaking in very high terms of our historical paper in the last REGISTER and urging us to furnish more. It is really pleasant to know that our paper was so well received. We thank our readers for their pleasant words, and will try as soon as we can to gratify them with more matter of the variety asked for.

THE UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE.—We are pleased to welcome this standard work to our exchange list. We have already received great pleasure in the perusal of its pages,

and find several papers upon subjects interesting to Rhode Island. Such works as the *United Service* are truly an ornament and power in the literary world.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE WYOMING (PENN.) HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY, VOL. II., PART I.—We have received through the politeness of Sheldon Reynolds, Esq., the above. Its articles are timely and indicates that this society of historical students are energetic and enthusiastic in the pursuit of their chosen subjects. It is a pleasure to note such vigor, and we congratulate the society upon the great success of their enterprise.

SOCIETIES AND THEIR DOINGS.

RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY. — Oct. 6, 1885. The most important piece of business transacted at this meeting was the appointing of a committee to act in connection with a committee appointed by the Veteran Citizens Historical Association, the two to act with a committee appointed by the city government to devise a plan for the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Providence, which occurs next year.

Nov. 3, 1885. The first historical paper of the season's course was read before the Society by its President, Professor William Gammell; subject, "The Huguenots and the Edict of Nantes."

Nov. 17, 1885. The second paper was read before the Society by Miss Esther Bernon Carpenter, of South Kingstown; subject, "The Huguenot Influence in Rhode Island."

Dec. 1, 1885. The third paper was read before the Society by Amasa M. Eaton, Esq., of Providence; subject, "The French Spoliation Claims and Rhode Island Claimants."

Dec. 15, 1885. The fourth paper was read before the Society by Carl W. Earnst, editor of the *Beacon*; subject, "In-

ternational Law and the Labors of Henry Wheaton." Hon. Abraham Payne gave a brief sketch of Wheaton's life.

THE VETERAN CITIZENS' HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.—Oct. 5, 1885.—The first meeting of the season was held in their lecture room, the meeting being addressed by E. H. Hazard, Esq. of South Kingstown, upon incidents in the Narragansett country, and by Hon. Abraham Payne on reminiscences of Providence. A committee was appointed to act with a similar committee appointed by the city government and the Rhode Island Historical Society to devise a plan for the proper celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Providence, which occurs next year.

Nov. 2, 1885.—In absence of both the President and orator of the day, the Secretary made report of proceedings of the anniversary committee and made remarks relating to early history of Providence and also in regard to the Palatine light. Jas. N. Arnold, Esq., also made remarks upon the latter subject.

Dec. 7, 1885.—The Secretary, Rev. Frederic Denison, read a paper upon the "Israelites in Rhode Island." Myer Noot, the Jewish Rabbi, read a short essay and performed in Hebrew part of their divine worship.

THE PROVIDENCE FRANKLIN SOCIETY.—Sept. 15.—Prof. W. W. Bailey read a poem of welcome. An interesting exhibit of minerals and flowers were shown by the members.

Sept. 29.—Mr. T. P. Noyes read a paper on Meteorology, with incidents regarding cyclones, tornadoes, etc.

Oct. 27.—Mr. Samuel Austin read a paper on "Applied Science." A short talk on maples was had.

Nov. 10.—J. Tabot Pitman read a paper entitled "The Mechanical System of Natural Philosophy."

Dec. 10.—Dr. C. B. Johnson read a paper, "Lessons of Science as Read from the Heavens."

THE SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY.—Oct. 20.—Judge Pardon E. Tillinghast read a paper entitled "Reminiscences of the 12th R. I. Volunteers," and a memorial of Col. George H. Browne.

The November meeting was not held.

Dec. 15.—Dr. Wm. F. Hutchinson, in lieu of a paper, gave an address from his notes on "Farragut and his Times."

RHODE ISLAND ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—This band of natural history students have not as yet commenced their season's work, but plans are now completed looking to the season's work before them, the nature of which we hope to report in future numbers of the REGISTER.

THE BARRINGTON HISTORIC ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY.—This new and vigorous society, which was founded in May last, have not as yet commended their season's meetings for historical study. We are in hopes, however, to report in future numbers of the REGISTER the good work done by this band of earnest workers in historical pursuits.

THE NEWPORT HISTORICAL SOCIETY.—Oct. 20.—A paper was read which was prepared by the President of the Society, entitled "William Pitt" (Lord Chatham). Several valuable mementoes were contributed to the society's museum.

Nov. 17.—Dr. Henry E. Turner read a paper, "Newport Sixty years ago."

Dec. 15.—Valuable additions were made to the societies museum. A paper entitled "Newport Forty years ago" was read by John L. Dennis. A paper was read by Henry W. French, "Life and Writings of Washington Irving," and a paper by Miss Mattie Smith, entitled, "English Country Life as portrayed by the Sketch Book."

NEWPORT NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.—Dec. 3.—A paper was read by Rev. Charles G. Gilliot, entitled "Anthracite Coal." We understand that this society has a fine course of lectures and work in preparation and that it is doing a good work in its especial field for Southern Rhode Island.



MARVELLOUS PRICES. BOOKS FOR THE MILLION

Complete Novels and Other Works, by Famous Authors, Almost Given Away!

The following books are published in neat pamphlet form, many of them handsomely illustrated, and all are printed from good type upon good paper. They treat of a great variety of subjects, and we think no one can examine the list without finding therein many that he or she would like to possess. In cloth-bound form these books would cost \$1.00 each. Each book is complete in itself.

1. **The Widow Bedott Papers.** This is the book over which your grandmothers laughed till they cried, and it is just as funny to-day as it ever was.

2. **Fancy Work for Home Adornment,** an entirely new work upon this subject, containing easy and practical instructions for making fancy baskets, wall pockets, brackets, needle work, embroidery, etc., etc., profusely and elegantly illustrated.

3. **Grimm's Fairy Stories for the Young.** The finest collection of fairy stories ever published. The children will be delighted with them.

4. **The Lady of the Lake.** By Sir Walter Scott. "The Lady of the Lake" is a romance in verse, and of all the works of Scott none is more beautiful than this.

5. **Manual of Etiquette for Ladies and Gentlemen,** a guide to politeness and good breeding, giving the rules of modern etiquette for all occasions.

6. **The Standard Letter Writer for Ladies and Gentlemen,** a complete guide to correspondence, giving plain directions for the composition of letters of every kind, with innumerable forms and examples.

7. **Winter Evening Recreations,** a large collection of Acting Characters, Tableaux, Games, Puzzles, etc., for social gatherings, private theatricals, and evenings at home; illustrated.

8. **Dialogues, Recitations and Readings,** a large and choice collection for school exhibitions and public and private entertainments.

9. **Parlor Magic and Chemical Experiments,** a book which tells how to perform hundreds of amusing tricks in magic and instructive experiments with simple agents.

10. **The Home Cook Book and Family Physician,** containing hundreds of excellent cooking recipes and hints to housekeepers, also telling how to cure all common ailments by simple home remedy.

11. **Manners and Customs in Far Away Lands,** a very interesting and instructive book of travels, describing the peculiar life, habits, manners and customs of the people of foreign countries; illustrated.

12. **Sixteen Complete Stories by Popular Authors,** embracing love, humorous and detective stories, stories of society life, of adventure, of railway life, etc., all very interesting.

13. **The Budget of Wit, Humor and Fun,** a large collection of the funny stories, sketches, anecdotes, poems, and jokes that have been written for some years; illustrated.

14. **Useful Knowledge for the Million,** a handy book of useful information for all, upon many and various subjects; illustrated.

15. **Called Back.** A Novel, By Hugh Conway, author of "Dark Days," etc.

16. **At the World's Mercy.** A Novel, By Florence Warden, author of "The House on the Marsh," etc.

17. **Mildred Trevanion.** A Novel, By "The Duchess," author of "Molly Bawn," etc.

18. **Dark Days.** A Novel, By Hugh Conway, author of "Called Back," etc.

19. **The Mystery of the Holly Tree.** A Novel, By the author of "Dora Thorne."

20. **Shadows on the Snow.** A Novel, By B. L. Farjeon, author of "Bread-and-Cheese-and-Kisses," etc.

21. **The Gray Woman.** A Novel, By Mrs. Gaskell, author of "Mary Barton," etc.

22. **The Frozen Deep.** A Novel, By Wilkie Collins, author of "The Woman in White," etc.

23. **Red Court Farm.** A Novel, By Mrs. Henry Wood, author of "East Lynne," etc.

24. **In Cupid's Net.** A Novel, By the Author of "Dora Thorne."

25. **Back to the Old Home.** A Novel, By Mary Cecil Hay, author of "Hidden Perils," etc.

26. **John Bowerbank's Wife.** A Novel, By Miss Mulock, author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," etc.

27. **Lady Geraldine's Dream.** A Novel, By the author of "Dora Thorne," etc.

28. **Janper Dane's Secret.** A Novel, By Miss M. E. Braddon, author of "Aurora Floyd," etc.

29. **Leoline.** A Novel, By Mary Cecil Hay, author of "Brenda Yorke," etc.

30. **Gabriel's Marriage.** A Novel, By Wilkie Collins, author of "No Name," etc.

31. **David Hunt.** A Novel, By Mrs. Ann S. Stephens, author of "Fashion and Famine," etc.

32. **Heaping the Whirlwind.** A Novel, By Mary Cecil Hay, author of "Old Middleton's Money," etc.

33. **Dudley Carleton.** A Novel, By Miss M. E. Braddon, author of "Lady Audley's Secret," etc.

34. **Essays on the Mystery of the Headlands.** A Novel, By Etta W. Pierce, author of "The Birth Mark," etc.

35. **A Golden Dawn.** A Novel, By the author of "Dora Thorne," etc.

36. **Valerie's Fate.** A Novel, By Mrs. Alexander, author of "The Wooling O't," etc.

37. **Sister Rose.** A Novel, By Wilkie Collins, author of "The Woman in White," etc.

38. **Anne.** A Novel, By Mrs. Henry Wood, author of "East Lynne."

39. **The Laurel Bush.** A Novel, By Miss Mulock, author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," etc.

40. **Amos Barton.** A Novel, By George Eliot, author of "Adam Bede," "The Mill on the Floss," etc.

OUR UNEQUALLED OFFER:

We will send any two of these books and our catalogue, containing prices of all leading papers and books for 6 cents in stamps. Any 8 books \$20 each, or the whole \$40 for \$1.00. Send P. O. note, Registered Letter, or Money Order, and address at once.

Franklin News Co., Philad'a, Pa.

THE GENEALOGICAL DICTIONARY OF RHODE ISLAND.

Persons interested in this work (who have not already subscribed) should send for circular answering queries as to

Paper, Type, Binding, Size, Delivery, &c.

Address, J. O. Austin, P. O. Box 81, Providence, R. I.

VILLA PAINTS.

We wish to call your attention to the remarkable qualities possessed by our VILLA PAINTS. These paints are in paste form, and require only the addition of Linseed Oil. They are the most durable and economical paint ever put upon the market. They cost the consumer at the present prices less than One Dollar a gallon, when thinned ready for use, viz.:

100 pounds Villa Paint at 6 1-2 cts. - - - \$6.50.

8 gallons Boiled Linseed Oil at 53 cts. - 4.24.

\$10.74.

This will produce 12 galls. at 90 cts. per gall.

These paints comprise all the fashionable shades, and the colors being ground into the paint through the mill, will not fade or spot as when mixed by hand. We can refer to owners of hundreds of buildings that have used the VILLA PAINTS during the past 15 years, and we only ask a trial of this paint to convince the most skeptical.

Put up in 100 lb. Kegs and 25 lb. Tin Pails. Sample cards furnished upon application.

OLIVER JOHNSON & CO., Sole Manufacturers,

—DEALERS IN—

**WHITE ♦ LEAD, ♦ VARNISHES, ♦ WINDOW ♦ GLASS,
AND PAINTERS' SUPPLIES,**

13 to 19 Exchange Street, - - Providence, R. I.

JOHN B. PEIRCE & SON,

DEALERS IN

CORN, MEAL, FEED, OATS, &C.

Grist Mill,

BRADLEY'S FERTILIZERS,

BROWN ST., - WICKFORD.

George T. Cranston,

THE SWAMPTOWN MERCHANT,

STILL CONTINUES AT THE

Farmers Exchange & General Variety Store.

Where he continues to serve his customers, old and new, with all goods at

BOTTOM PRICES.

Order wagons run regularly through all the adjoining villages.

WEST WICKFORD, R. I.

S. I. PARKIS,

DEALER IN

Choice Groceries,

Dry Goods, Boots and Shoes,

CROCKERY, GLASS WARE,

—AND—

General Family Supplies.

HAMILTON, R. I.

GENEALOGICAL NOTES

—OF—

New York and New England Families.

COMPILED BY

S. V. TALCOTT.

This work, of 800 pages, is now ready for delivery. **PRICE, \$6.00.**

Address the author,

S. V. TALCOTT,

Albany, N. Y.